



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



TRANSFERRED
TO



HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Essays on the Crusades.



1.60
10
16.00

THE INTERNATIONAL MONTHLY,

Burlington, Vt.,

1903.

Reprinted from
THE INTERNATIONAL MONTHLY,
Burlington, Vt.,
1903.
FOX, DUFFIELD & COMPANY,
35 West Street,
New York.

19
1.60
1140
19
3070

~~H 261.2.1~~

~~H
E.186~~

Crus 130.40

~~H
E.140~~

January 4, 1905.
HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Historical Department

~~90
45461~~

Copyright, 1903, by
Frederick A. Richardson,
Published Feb., 1903.

90*141

100

CONTENTS.

CHRISTIAN AND INFIDEL IN THE HOLY LAND,

Dana C. Munro,

Professor in the University of Wisconsin.

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF WESTERN
EUROPE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE CRUSADES,

Hans Prutz,

Professor of History, Nancy, France.

THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE AND THE CRUSADES,

Charles Diehl,

Professor in the University of Königsberg.

INTRODUCTION.

A HUNDRED years ago the French Academy offered a prize for the best work on the influence of the crusades. This offer produced two volumes, by Heeren and Choiseul-Daillecourt, which attracted much attention. But the action of the Academy was premature; at that time it was not possible to discuss the subject in a satisfactory manner. The necessary preliminary work in editing and criticizing the sources had scarcely been begun.

Realizing this, Ranke, some thirty years later, chose the sources for the first crusade as the subject for his seminar work. The outcome was the "*Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs*," published by Sybel, who had been one of Ranke's pupils. This placed the whole study of the crusades on a new basis, as Sybel demonstrated conclusively the unreliability of William of Tyre's account of the first crusade, on which earlier writers had relied. Some of Sybel's other statements aroused opposition which led to more careful study.

About the middle of the nineteenth century a group of able French scholars began the publication of the "*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*." Up to the present time there have been published in this series fourteen large folio volumes, including Western, Greek, Arabic, Armenian, and legal sources. In addition other sources in each field have been edited critically. So that now, although much still remains to be done we have a large body of trustworthy material for the history of the crusades.

INTRODUCTION

v

In the last thirty years Riant, Röhricht, Hagenmeyer, Kugler, and others, have published many special studies and critical editions of sources. Heyd has illuminated the whole subject of the commerce between the Orient and the Occident. Finlay and his successors have placed the Byzantine history in an entirely new light. The Orientalists have made a promising beginning on the Arabic and Armenian historical works. Many legal documents have been unearthed and published. As a result of these special studies we are now in a position to coördinate their conclusions, and to discuss the influence of the crusades, or the relations which existed between the Franks and the Eastern peoples with whom they came into contact.

A beginning was made twenty years ago when Prutz published his "*Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*." This is the most important work on the subject; but it is unsatisfactory because Prutz did not have access to a sufficient amount of source-material. It is interesting to note in the essay on "*The Economic Development of Western Europe under the Influence of the Crusades*," the modifications, additions, or corrections which the work of the last two decades has rendered necessary. Readers who are not familiar with his history have an opportunity here to learn the point of view which he had reached after long study.

Although many of the conclusions set forth in this volume have not appeared in any English work, they have been drawn already by foreign writers and may be regarded as well established. On the other hand, it should be remembered that these are "essays" and that some of the points are still under discussion. For example, in the essay on "*Christian and Infidel in the Holy Land*," the character of the Franks is portrayed in a much more

favorable light than in any previous work. The sources, accessible at present, seem to justify this and the arguments might have been made even stronger by more extensive citations. But it is possible that new sources and more extended study may compel us to modify the statements.

In the essay on "The Byzantine Empire and the Crusades," Diehl insists that the Emperor Alexius did not summon the crusaders. Röhricht and Hagenmeyer believe that he did. Their names and arguments carry great weight; on the other hand, it should be remembered that Diehl is one of the most learned and trustworthy authorities on Byzantine matters. As a whole, he sets forth the actions and motives of the Greek emperors more favorably than previous writers have done.

These examples show the opportunities for further critical work on the crusades. To the men of the present day the subject may well have a special fascination; for that age was a period of expansion, similar in some respects to that in which we are now living.

DANA C. MUNRO.

CHRISTIAN AND INFIDEL IN THE
HOLY LAND



DANA C. MUNRO



CHRISTIAN AND INFIDEL IN THE HOLY LAND



THE term crusade, when pronounced, arouses in our minds the thought of a holy war. We picture the crusaders as devout warriors, full of fanaticism, waging incessant strife against the infidels. The latter we think of as equally fanatical, engaged in a Jihad, a holy war of extermination, against the Christians. These ideas are derived originally from the works of the contemporary chroniclers, both Frankish and Mohammedan. The crusaders who wrote the chronicles were usually members of the clergy and were interested chiefly in depicting the victories and defeats of the soldiers of the cross. They represented the kings as indefatigable warriors. They regarded the slaughter of the Mussulmans as a pious duty. The Moslem chroniclers foster the same idea, for, in speaking of the Franks, they repeat constantly, "May Allah curse them!" Thus has been formed the belief in the fanati-

cism of both Christians and infidels, which we find reflected in the pages of Wilken, Michaud, and most of the earlier writers on the crusades.

But when we extend our study to the laws of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, to the legal documents which were the result of their daily activity, to the coins which were struck by the Christian and Muslim princes, to the accounts of the travelers who visited the Holy Land while under the Frankish rule, to the books written by the Armenian and Greek contemporaries, we obtain an entirely different picture. We find but slight indications of a fanatical spirit on either side. We see the Christians and infidels in constant and friendly intercourse. We learn that each respected the other, that each was ready to learn and to copy such customs as seemed advantageous, and, finally, that they trusted one another.

On re-reading the chronicles, with this additional knowledge and with greater care, the second view is confirmed. Military achievements, it is true, form the main substance of the narrative, but whole years are passed over without a comment, because the author found no congenial material to record. And although he wrote mainly of warfare, frequently it was a strife not against the infidel, but against the co-religionist. Furthermore, in many instances Christian and Mussulman fought side by side against either Christians or Mussulmans, as the interests of the moment determined. Involuntary expressions of admiration for the enemy occur frequently, especially in the Arabic historians.

Gradually the impression is formed that their constantly recurring "May Allah curse them!" is merely a stylistic phrase, and has but little meaning. Müller was right when he wrote, "The whole of the Christians, as of the Mohammedans, were really in earnest only twice; the former in 1099, the latter in 1187. On the first occasion, the Franks took Jerusalem from the Mohammedans; on the second, the Mohammedans recaptured it from the Franks; and with this the history of the religious wars, properly speaking, was ended."

We are apt also to mistake the motives of the Christians. In discussing the causes of the crusades, almost all historians, until recently, have laid the main stress upon the religious characteristics of the age. We have been taught that the men in the West, especially at the beginning of the movement, were inspired by a feeling of fanaticism, by a spirit of asceticism, which led hundreds of thousands to offer themselves eagerly for service in the cause of Christ. Undoubtedly, religious enthusiasm was one of the causes. No great movement in the Middle Ages can be fully explained without an understanding of the part which religion played in the lives of the people. But, lately, specialists have felt that this explanation was inadequate. There has been a more or less conscious tendency to return to the standpoint of Heeren, who explained the crusades as primarily a colonizing movement. He argued that they were very similar to the migrations of the Normans which resulted in building up colonies and states in Southern Italy. Kugler stated the case even more strongly. His words

4 THE CRUSADES A COLONIZING MOVEMENT.

were, "Among specialists in mediæval history, it is an accepted fact that the crusades were to a great extent the result of economic causes, and that they belong to the general history of colonization."

This point of view receives additional confirmation when we study the preliminaries of the first crusades. Pope Urban II., in his speech at the Council of Clermont, used every argument which he thought would attract men to undertake a crusade. In particular, according to Robert the Monk, he dwelt upon the advantages to be secured by the conquest of Jerusalem. "This land which you inhabit," he said, "is too small for your large population; it does not abound in wealth; and it furnishes scarcely food enough for its cultivators. * * * Enter upon the road to the Holy Sepulchre; wrest that land from the wicked race and subject it to yourselves. That land, as the Scripture says, 'floweth with milk and honey!' * * * The land is fruitful above all others, like another paradise of delights." It is to be noted that Urban took it for granted that the Holy Land would be held by the conquerors.

Several of the leaders of the first crusade had decided, before leaving their homes, to remain in the land which they expected to conquer. Bohemond, son of Robert Guiscard, had failed to secure his father's principality in Southern Italy, and used the crusade as an opportunity to obtain a new dominion for himself. He was acquainted, to some extent, with the conditions in the East, and he determined to make Antioch, the wealthiest city in Syria, his capital. Count Raymond of Toulouse, in

spite of his great possessions, is said to have taken an oath before his departure that he would never return. He was termed by a contemporary "as land-greedy as a Norman"; from the very beginning, his great desire was to secure a new principality, and to the end of his life he worked steadily to accomplish this object. Godfrey of Bouillon pledged all his important possessions to secure the money necessary for the journey, and left Lothringen with the intention of remaining in the East. Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey, took his wife with him and practically severed his connection with the West.

Alexius, the Greek Emperor, who had appealed to the Pope for aid against the Seljukian Turks, was alarmed at the attitude of the crusaders. He feared, only too justly, that, instead of regaining by their aid the ancient possessions of the Roman Empire in Asia Minor and Syria, he would see these occupied by his hereditary foe, Bohemond, and other Christians hostile to the Greeks. Consequently, he was unwilling that the armies of crusaders should continue their march until they had made some agreement with him. The difficulties which arose between him and the leaders of the crusade were due to his determination to profit by their conquest, and to their unwillingness to have him do so.

The regulations which were made upon entering the enemy's country show the purpose of the chiefs. Each one was to possess any city in which he was the first to plant his banner. As Raymond of Agiles complained, "Each one wished only the greatest possible advantage

for himself and thought not at all of the common good." Baldwin and Tancred, as soon as they reached Cilicia, endeavored to make conquests for their own profit. When the former was offered the opportunity of ruling in Edessa, he abandoned promptly all farther participation in the expedition against Jerusalem. On the death of his wife, he married almost immediately an Armenian princess, in order to make his position as ruler of Edessa more secure. The progress of the main army was impeded constantly by the quarrels which arose concerning the ownership of individual cities which had been conquered. After the capture of Antioch, for instance, farther advance was delayed for a long time by the quarrels which arose about the possession of this and other cities. In fact, the leaders showed such an evident desire to neglect the conquest of Jerusalem, in order to obtain possessions in the more wealthy Syria, that the common people rebelled and forced the nobles to continue the march. Before Jerusalem was conquered the leaders attempted to decide to whom it should be given.

After the great victory over the Egyptians near Ascalon, in 1099, the city itself was lost to the Christians, because Count Raymond was determined he would have it or else no one should. Duke Godfrey demanded it as a part of his possessions. In consequence of their strife, Ascalon, which had been on the point of surrendering, was not captured. A little later, the mutual hostility of Raymond and Godfrey had the same result in the case of Arsuf, which Raymond had almost succeeded in capturing. In the following years, whenever any

one secured a foothold anywhere, he attempted immediately to extend his possessions. Aid was obtained from the Genoese and Venetians by grants of quarters in cities to be captured in the future. Repeatedly, lands not yet conquered were given to the Church. Baldwin in the early years of his reign styled himself "King of Asia and Babylon," a title which is indicative of a purpose to make further conquests.

In the pursuance of this policy of conquest, the coast cities were captured, much of the interior country was covered with the castles of the crusaders, and the natives were reduced to subjection. Then the most important problem which confronted the Franks was the maintenance of their rule over an alien, mixed population far more numerous than themselves, which was separated from them by the barriers of religion, language, and customs. To any one who has been accustomed to think of men in the Middle Ages as narrow, intolerant, and bigoted, their conduct is very instructive. They realized that if they wished to be successful, they must secure the good will of the natives. They were intent mainly on extending their colonies and increasing their commerce. They were forced by their position to depend, to a great extent, upon the services of the natives, Christian and infidel; and, consequently, in spite of the objections of the fanatical, most of the leaders endeavored to conciliate the inhabitants of all races and creeds.

In order to understand the position of the two, we must consider the physical characteristics of the country

and the different nations who inhabited it. Mukadassi, an Arab geographer, who was a native of Jerusalem, described the former very well:—

“Syria is very pleasantly situated. The country, physically, may be divided into four zones. The first zone is that on the border of the Mediterranean Sea. It is the plain country, the sandy tracts following one another, and alternating with the cultivated land. * * * The second zone is the mountain country, well-wooded, and possessing many springs, with frequent villages and cultivated fields. * * * The third zone is that of the valleys of the (Jordan) Ghaur, wherein are found many villages and streams, also palm-trees, well-cultivated fields, and indigo plantations. * * * The fourth zone is that bordering on the Desert. * * * The mountains here are high and bleak, and the climate resembles that of the Waste; but it has many villages, with springs of water and forest trees.”¹

Of these four zones the Christians gradually conquered three, and even some outposts in the fourth, but they were never lords of Damascus, Emesa, or Aleppo. For a long time they held only scattered positions and were surrounded on all sides by the Mohammedan princes. At the time when the Frankish possessions were greatest, the extreme length north and south was about 525 miles, the breadth was fifty miles or less, except in the extreme North. Consequently they were always in close touch along the whole frontier with their Mohammedan neighbors. Border raids were common occurrences.

(1) Translation taken from Le Strange, *Palestine Under the Moslems*.

It was necessary for them to draw most of their subsistence from the country. Fortunately Syria was then exceptionally fertile. Mukadassi, writing a century before the beginning of the crusades, said :—

“Now Syria is a land of blessing, a country of cheapness, abounding in fruits, and peopled by holy men. The upper province, which is near the dominions of the Greeks, is rich in streams and crops, and the climate of it is cold. And the lower province is even more excellent, and pleasanter by reason of the lusciousness of its fruits, and in the great number of its palm-trees. But in the whole country of Syria there is no river carrying boats, except only for the ferry. * * * And further, know that within the province of Palestine may be found gathered together six-and-thirty products that are not found thus united in any other land. Of these the first seven are found in Palestine alone ; the following seven are very rare in other countries ; and the remaining two-and-twenty, though found thus gathered together only in this province, are, for the most part, found one and another, singly, in other lands.”¹

It was veritably, “a land flowing with milk and honey” until the later Turkish misrule brought it to its present desolate condition. Its great agricultural resources furnished a large portion of the income which the Franks received. In order to profit by the fertility farmers were necessary. The Franks were never sufficiently numerous to supply a body of agricultural laborers, and consequently had to depend upon the natives, Christian and Moslem, to till the fields and harvest the crops.

(1) Translation taken from Le Strange.

The inhabitants whom they found in the Holy Land were of various races and creeds. The largest element in the population was composed of the Syrians,—Christians who spoke Arabic and used the Greek liturgy, but who were nominally subject to the Roman Church. They were for the most part agricultural laborers or artisans. Closely connected with the Syrians were the Maronites, who were renowned for their skill as archers, and who formed one of the most useful portions of the Frankish infantry. The Jacobites and Nestorians appear to have been the most civilized of the native Christians. They had excellent schools and were well-versed in the knowledge then common in the Orient. The Armenians were especially numerous in the North and were renowned for their bravery. They had welcomed the crusaders, “who,” as Matthew of Edessa wrote, “came to break the chains of the Christians, to free from the yoke of the infidels the holy city of Jerusalem, and to tear from the hands of the Mussulmans the consecrated tomb which received a God.” They joined eagerly in fighting the Mussulmans and were the most important allies of the Franks. The Greeks or Griffons formed a considerable part of the population, especially in the North. Finally there were a few Georgians or Iberians.

Of the non-Christian natives the Arabs and the Turks were the most prominent. The civilization of the former was far superior to that of the Franks. The Turks were not very numerous. They had but recently obtained possession of the land and were for

the most part soldiers; they were of little or no importance for cultivating the land or in commerce. Besides the orthodox Mohammedan there were Druses, Nosairis, or Ansarians, Bathenians, or Ismaelians, and Beduins.

Of Jews and Samaritans, Benjamin of Tudela, who was in the Holy Land about 1165, enumerated 2,500 or more in the account of his travels, and it is probable that he was speaking only of the heads of the families. They were employed mainly in dyeing and glass-making.

The Europeans in the Holy Land were styled collectively Franks, but under this designation were included Frenchmen, Normans, Italians, Lothringians, and Provençals, not to mention the other nations which were less numerous represented. In the early decades of the twelfth century, the men from the North,—the Lothringians at Jerusalem, the Normans at Antioch,—were the most numerous, and under their leadership the conquests were made. Later the Provençals and Italians became the dominant party; they were more interested in trade, and did not care to make any conquests which would not be profitable. The Southern nations mixed more readily with the native populations, and, as their offspring, we find a large number of half-breeds, the so-called Pullani.

From this brief enumeration the great diversity of peoples and creeds is evident. This very diversity caused all to become less narrow-minded, more tolerant. Furthermore, when differences arose between the representatives of two nations, the Germans and French-

men, for example, each party sought allies on all sides, regardless of race or creed. In this way national differences were becoming constantly less important; a cosmopolitan feeling, if we may be allowed to use a much abused phrase, arose. As is indicated by the existence of the class of Pullani, the Franks became intimately associated with the native Christians; and we have already spoken of the aid furnished by the Maronites, Armenians, and Turcoples in warfare. But it was not merely with the Christian natives that they were associated; they entered into fully as close an intimacy with the Saracens.

In reading the chronicles, the impression received is that all the natives were despised by the Franks. For the Syrians as a whole, Jacques de Vitry's account is the one usually quoted, although he was writing especially of the Pullani. The quotation of a part of this account will show the origin of many of our ideas relative to the depraved conditions of the inhabitants in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. He began by speaking of the Pullani:—

“Scarcely one in a thousand could be found who had kept his marriage vow sacredly; for violation of the marriage sacrament they did not consider a deadly sin. They were brought up weakly from their youth, and were given over entirely to the lusts of the flesh. As a rule they never listened to the word of God, but despised it. In addition, I found foreigners who, on account of various and heinous crimes, had fled from their homes as accursed, who without any fear of God, by their shameless conduct and impious example, were ruining the whole city (Jerusalem). Finally, I found one especially vicious and blind

class of men who surpassed all the others in corruption, Scribes and Pharisees, who took only milk and wool from their sheep, caring not at all for their souls, but by word and example leading the laity astray; these alone, when others repented and turned to the Lord, withstood His command and everything good, so that the word of the Scriptures was fulfilled: the publicans and harlots shall enter into the Kingdom of God sooner than they! * * *

“ * * * Open and secret murders happened almost every day and every night. By night the men strangled their wives when the latter no longer pleased them; while the women, as in ancient times, killed their husbands by poisons and deadly potions in order to be able to marry others. For there were in the city people who sold poison and deadly prescriptions, so that scarcely any one trusted another, and the members of a man's household were his enemies. A man confessed to us that a certain woman kept animals in her house out of whose excrements she prepared such artful potions that, if any one wished to kill his enemy, according to his desire, he found the means of destroying him, so that the enemy might live a year, or only a month, or if he wished to make haste, death might occur at the end of one day. The city was full of harlots everywhere; for, because they paid higher rents than other people, not merely laymen, but even the clerical rulers rented their dwellings throughout the whole city to harlots. Who could recount the crimes of this second Babylon, in which Christians refused baptism to Saracens, although the latter begged for it with tears and weeping? Those, their masters, (may my soul not come into companionship with such men!) said, ‘If they became Christians, we could not torture them as we wish to do.’ ”

Röhricht rightly characterizes this account as grossly exaggerated; but we have somewhat similar passages from others, especially William of Tyre and the author of “*Itinerarium Peregrinorum*.”

It is probable that such accounts are partly true, but greatly exaggerated. It was undoubtedly, in many respects, a degenerate and vicious society; and much of the degeneracy and vice arose from association with the crusaders and the pilgrims. The Western men in their Eastern home, freed from social restraints, subjected to a different climate, in contact with an alien civilization, and ruling over a subject race, degenerated in morals. This has been the result in every such conquest. Furthermore, many of the crusaders were men of bad character who had been obliged to leave their homes, and who had changed their country but not their character. Still it is evident that the authors mentioned are using rhetorical exaggerations. That the society as a whole could not have been as bad as they depicted it, will be shown in the following pages.

The first intercourse between the Christians and the infidels was in battle. This was probably advantageous to their cordial relations later. For the crusaders had left their homes with a strong feeling of contempt for their opponents. They had been taught that the Mohammedans were cowards. The following quotation is indicative of their ideas: "For the Turk never ventures upon close fight; * * * and as he has poisoned arrows, venom, and not valor, inflicts death on the man he strikes. Whatever he effects, then, I attribute to fortune, not to courage, because he wars by flight and by poison. It is apparent, too, that every race, born in that region, being scorched with the intense heat of the sun, abounds more in reflection than in blood; and, there-

fore, they avoid coming to close quarters, because they are aware how little blood they possess."¹ When they met in battle, this feeling of contempt was dispelled. The crusaders realized that they had met with worthy antagonists. This change of attitude is shown clearly in the "Gesta Francorum," which is one of the comparatively few chronicles of the early period written by a layman. The author speaks in the highest terms of the bravery of their foes. "They say that they are Franks by origin and that no man ought naturally to be a soldier except the Franks and themselves. * * * Certainly if they had always stood firm in the faith of Christ, and in the holy Christianity, and had been willing to confess one God in the Trinity * * * no one could find more powerful or braver or more talented warriors than they." The Moslems, too, admired the valor of their opponents. Nur ed-din declared that "the Franks are the bravest among mortals." Kamel-ed-din in his history constantly praises the bravery of the Christians. Ousâma at the close of his long life, much of which had been spent in fighting against the crusaders, gives as his opinion that "the Franks are (may Allah curse them!) the most prudent warriors in the world." And he meant by this the highest possible praise. This recognition of their mutual valor caused the disappearance of much of the prejudice on both sides. Frequently Christians sought Mussulmans as allies against other Christians. In 1108, Joscelin of Courtenay obtained aid from the Arabs in his

(1) Translation from *William of Malmesbury* in the Bohn Library.

contest with Tancred. Baldwin I. entered into a compact with the Muslim rulers of Damascus and Aleppo. Later such alliances became very frequent. The Muslim princes were at strife among themselves and eagerly sought help from the Christian rulers. The Templars entered into an alliance with the Assassins. When Frederick Barbarossa was preparing to go on his crusade, he made an ally of the Sultan of Iconium, and the Greek Emperor in his turn allied himself with Saladin. There are many such alliances recorded, and these paved the way for friendly relations in times of peace.

Before leaving the military movements, we may pause to note one minor result. The ruins of fortresses which the Franks constructed bear witness to the rapid progress which was made by the crusaders when they came into contact with the Byzantine and Arab engineers. The Templars especially copied the Oriental castles, and their fortifications are far better constructed than the contemporary ones in the West.

But the intercourse was not wholly, or even generally, of a hostile character. The Franks were brought into constant and friendly relations with the Muslims in the pursuits of peace. All of their lands had to be cultivated by the native farmers, and many of these were Mohammedans. Frequently, the Christian lord was surrounded almost exclusively by the Muslim population. As the latter understood farming much better than the Franks, the crusaders soon learned to depend upon them. Through the commerce the Christians and infidels were brought into close connec-

tion. The Genoese, Pisans, Venetians, and others had taken part in the crusade chiefly for the purpose of advancing their trade. All of the Franks were compelled to depend upon the Mohammedans for some of the necessities of life. Syria had enjoyed a very extensive commerce before the crusades, and many of the cities carried on a very considerable caravan trade. Consequently, friendly relations were established, from the very beginning, with the most important Muslim centres of commerce. In 1099, almost as soon as Jerusalem had been conquered, a firm peace was established with Ascalon, which controlled the commerce between Egypt and Syria, and with Damascus, which was important for the overland caravan trade.

The necessity of protection for individuals when travelling also led to much friendly intercourse. It was a common practice for a leader on either side to request a safe conduct from his adversary for any one who wished to travel either for business or for pleasure. This was seldom violated. Ousâma's autobiography furnishes several instances of such safe conducts and of the ease with which they were granted. Ousâma obtained one from Baldwin III. when he wished his wives and children to travel through the Christian territories. In this instance, Ousâma charged Baldwin with having caused the wrecking of the vessel on which his family had taken passage, in order to obtain the booty; but he stated, also, that Baldwin at once sent on his wives and children in safety and gave to them five hundred pieces of gold for their journey. On another occasion, a Christian knight

visited Ousâma's father, simply out of curiosity, in order to see the man who had struck a memorable blow. Tancred, indefatigable warrior as he was, exchanged safe conducts with his foes, and made use of their hospitality for his followers.

The Franks frequently found it necessary to seek the aid of the natives in the arts and industries. Their houses were built after Oriental models. Their palaces and churches were decorated by the Greek and Arab artists. The dyeing and glass-making, as has been already noted, were in the hands of the Jews. In their dress they copied the Oriental forms, because they found them better suited to the country. At their feasts and festivities the Muslim dancing girls were in great demand, in spite of the opposition of the Church.

The Franks preferred the Eastern doctors, Syrian, Jewish, or Mohammedan. The last, especially, were noted for their ability, and were summoned for all important cases which baffled the skill of the Christians. When Amalric I. found that his son, later Baldwin IV., called the Leper, was suffering from some disease which the Christian doctors could not cure, he sent, as a last resort, for the most renowned physicians from Damascus. Passing in this way from one party to the other, the doctors furnished a ready means of communication between the two, and were often employed in confidential missions, sometimes even as diplomatic agents. In addition, Franks and Arabs willingly exchanged medical prescriptions, and each one increased his own medical and surgical knowledge from the experience of the

other. It is needless to add that the Franks were the great gainers by this interchange of ideas. A striking picture of the difference in the methods of the two races is given in the anecdotes of Ousâma. His uncle had been asked to send a doctor to the Franks, who had several urgent cases. The doctor returned in ten days and said : —

“They brought to me a knight with an abscess in his leg, and a woman troubled with fever. I applied to the knight a little cataplasma; his abscess opened and took a favorable turn. As for the woman, I forbade her to eat certain foods, and I lowered her temperature. I was there when a Frankish doctor arrived, who said, ‘This man can’t cure them!’ Then, addressing the knight, he asked, ‘Which do you prefer, to live with a single leg, or to die with both of your legs?’ ‘I prefer,’ replied the knight, ‘to live with a single leg.’ ‘Then bring,’ said the doctor, ‘a strong knight with a sharp axe.’ The knight and axe were not slow in coming. I was present. The doctor stretched the leg of the patient on a block of wood, and then said to the knight, ‘Cut off his leg with the axe, detach it with a single blow.’ Under my eyes, the knight gave a violent blow, but it did not cut the leg off. He gave the unfortunate man a second blow, which caused the marrow to flow from the bone, and the knight died immediately.

“As for the woman, the doctor examined her and said, ‘She is a woman with a devil in her head, by which she is possessed. Shave her hair.’ They did so, and she began to eat again, like her compatriots, garlic and mustard. Her fever grew worse. The doctor then said, ‘The devil has gone into her head.’ Seizing a razor he cut into her head in the form of a cross and excoriated the skin in the middle so deeply that the bones were uncovered. * * * Then he rubbed her head with salt. The woman, in her turn, expired immediately. After asking them if my

services were still needed, and after receiving a negative answer, I returned, having learned from their medicine matters of which I had previously been ignorant."

Ousâma, on the other hand, is careful to record a remedy for scrofula which he had learned from a Frank, and which he said was always efficacious.

The superior knowledge of medicine and of the natural sciences possessed by the Arabs caused some of the Franks to distrust them greatly. The crusaders frequently attributed any sudden death to poison. They believed, as in the account quoted from Jacques de Vitry, that the Arabs had the ability to administer poison that did not affect the system at first, but that would work after a given time, which might be a week, a month, or a year. The death of Godfrey, of Tancred, and of other knights was imputed by some to poison administered by the infidel. Ousâma ridicules a Frank who tried to collect the value of a horse from the Arab of whom he had bought it more than a year before, because the horse had suddenly died. The Frank thought it must have been poisoned before the sale had been made.

In their amusements Christians and infidels mingled very readily. During the truces, the two frequently engaged in jousts and proved one another's skill in horsemanship, in the use of the lance, in the wielding of the sword, and in the hurling of the spear. All, even the knights of the religious orders, entered with zest into these friendly rivalries. Both Christian and infidel were extremely fond of hunting and falconry. A long section

in the Assizes is devoted to the laws concerning the latter subject. Ousâma, in his autobiography, devoted many pages to accounts of hunting experiences and to the art of falconry. The crusading leaders took their hunting dogs and falcons with them as a matter of course when they set out on the holy war. As the close proximity of the enemy exposed both parties to constant attack, hunting agreements were made by which each might hunt in security on disputed territory. Gifts of dogs and hawks were interchanged, and friendships were sometimes formed because of the mutual interest in breeding hunting animals.

Children on either side were often given as hostages and thus obtained a knowledge of both civilizations. Sometimes they were sent to the castle of a noble who professed the opposite faith, simply to be educated, just as the sons of knights in the West were sent to serve as pages. Ousâma told of such an offer made to him by one of his Christian friends, who said: "Oh, my brother! I am going home and I should like, with your consent, to take your son with me (the boy was then fourteen years old). He will see our knights, he will then learn wisdom and chivalry. When he comes back, he will be an intelligent man." Ousâma was much hurt at the implied slur upon his own countrymen, but courteously veiled his resentment, and alleged as a reason for his refusal, that the boy's grandmother was too fond of him to part with him. The Frank then desisted from his request, saying that he had no desire to cause sorrow to the grandmother.

As shown by the letter of Fulk of Chartres, quoted later, intermarriages between the members of the two religious faiths were not unknown. In addition, Christian women taken as slaves by the Muslims frequently became the mothers of future warriors, who were generally well disposed towards the Christians. The Franks, with natural egotism, thought that Nur ed-din derived his ability and valor from a Christian mother. Many romantic tales concerning the fortunes of Christian maidens and their children were current in the crusading States, and were interwoven into the popular songs of the day.

Another means of bringing about intercommunication between Christian and infidel was the possession of common places of worship. Jerusalem, as is well known, was a holy city to both. The Muslims made pilgrimages to the so-called Temple, which they believed to be the place from which Mohammed had started on his famous night-journey. They had learned from their Christian neighbors to honor certain images. One statue of the Virgin in a small village near Damascus was revered by both Moslem and Christian, who visited it in order to be healed of their diseases. In Egypt the fig-tree which had offered its fruit to the Virgin, and the spring in which she had washed the clothes of the infant Jesus were honored by the followers of both religions.

These associations and the points of similarity between the two religions caused many a debate. As the Mohammedans were often more learned and better skilled in dialectics than their Christian opponents, the latter sometimes found themselves silenced, if not convinced.

Not infrequently Christians became renegades and passed over to the Muslim faith, especially in times of disaster and danger, when it seemed as if Islam had proved itself the superior and, consequently, the true religion. Less frequently the reverse happened. But after the victory at Ascalon, in 1099, some of the Mohammedans adopted the faith of the conquerors, and there were converts on many other occasions. At the siege of Acre, in the third crusade, when the inhabitants feared that the city might be taken at any moment, many begged for baptism. The author of the "Itinerarium" states that he feared that it was terror, not divine grace, which led to this change of heart, but concludes charitably that the ways of salvation are many.

In order to understand the attitude of the crusaders towards the Mohammedans who lived under their rule, it is necessary to consider their feelings towards the natives in general. For they made little real distinction between heretical Christians, such as the Syrians, Armenians, and Greeks, and the non-Christian population. Leading members of the clergy, like William of Tyre, regarded the Syrians with an extreme feeling of contempt, accused them of an entire lack of morality and of being effeminate and weak. The author of the "Tractatus de locis Terrae Sanctae" stated that they were useless as soldiers. The injustice of this last statement is evident, when we consider that one portion of them, the Maronites, were employed constantly as most useful allies in the crusading armies. These, and similar accusations, are due to their abhorrence of heresy. This was the great crime in the

eyes of the Churchmen, and men guilty of it might be justly suspected and accused, they thought, of any lesser crimes. As most of the chronicles were written by the members of the clergy, their general tone of contempt towards the natives can be easily understood.

But in the laws we find the Syrians, in particular, regarded differently. Of all the indigenous peoples they were the ones best treated and most highly regarded by the legislators. It was important to the Franks to win the favor of a class of inhabitants who were devoted to agriculture and commerce, and who were very numerous. According to the few statistics given by William of Tyre and Raymond of Agiles, there were 100,000 Syrians in Lebanon and the district about Tripolis alone. From the history of Jerusalem proper a few examples will serve as illustrations. Godfrey was renowned for governing equally well Syrians, Greeks, and Franks. Baldwin I. summoned native Christians to repeople Jerusalem, and granted important commercial privileges in the city to Syrians, Armenians, Greeks, and even Saracens. The Syrians were especially favored by the Franks at all times. They were protected in the ownership of property, they were admitted to all the rights which the citizens possessed, they were allowed to maintain their own courts, and in the Frankish courts they were allowed to testify against the Franks.

This same regard for the feelings of the natives is shown very clearly in the coins struck by the Christian princes. Baldwin I. at Edessa, that is, in 1099 or 1100, coined money representing himself with a cross in his

right hand and a Greek emblem, "Baldwin, servant of the cross." All of the Frankish rulers in the North used Greek legends. This was a device to make their money circulate more readily among the natives, who were accustomed to use the Greek language. Tancred went one step farther when he was prince of Antioch. He not only used a Greek legend, but was represented as wearing a turban. One of his coins is very interesting. On one side Christ is represented with a nimbus, on the reverse the legend in Greek is "the Grand Emir Tancred." In the Kingdom of Jerusalem the Venetians soon obtained the privilege of minting the money, on condition of paying a tax of fifteen per cent to the King. The coins which they struck were the so-called "besans saracénats," that is, the Saracenic besants. These had Arabic inscriptions, usually a text from the Koran, and were an almost exact imitation of the common Arabic coins. In fact, in all the European collections of coins they were for a long time classed as Mohammedan coins. It was formerly one of the great problems in numismatics to explain the non-existence of any coins of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. Many coins struck by Christians in the Holy Land are still erroneously supposed to be Arab coins. In the thirteenth century, some Christians were wounded in their conscience by the minting of such coins with the Muslim religious texts. Pope Innocent IV. forbade it under penalty of excommunication. Saint Louis forced a modification, so that a Christian legend replaced the Muslim text, and a minute cross was inserted in an inconspicuous place. But the Arab letters

were still retained for the legend, in order not to shock the feelings of the natives with whom they wished to carry on commerce.

It is also very interesting to note that some of the Mohammedan rulers adopted a similar device in order to further trade with the Christians. "On coins of the Urtukis, for example, a petty dynasty of some crusading fame that ruled a few fortresses in Mesopotamia, we meet with not only the figures of Byzantine Emperors, but those of Christ and the Virgin, with mangled inscriptions of Christian import. Figures of a similar character also appear on the coinage of the Ayyubis (Saladin's Kurdish house), and that of the Beny Zengy of Môsul and Syria, together with the earliest known representation of the two-headed eagle, which has since obtained high favor in Europe."¹

The agricultural laborers were well treated. As lords of the land the Franks seldom dispossessed the native farmers. They needed their services and allowed them to remain, using them very much as they had been in the habit of treating the villains on their former estates in the West. Undoubtedly, in the beginning there was oppression and cruelty, but, as time passed, the conditions of the Mohammedans improved. Ibn Djobair, who traveled through Syria, in 1184, recognized that his fellow Muslims were well treated by the Franks:—

"Between Tebnin (Toron) and Tyre we saw many villages, wholly inhabited by Mussulmans who live in great comfort under

(1) Lane-Poole, *Coins and Medals*, pp. 169, 170.

the Franks. The terms which are imposed upon them are the surrender of half the crop, at the time of the harvest, and the payment of a poll-tax of one 'dinar' and five 'kirats.' The Franks demand nothing more except a light tax upon the fruits; but the Mussulmans are masters of their dwellings and govern themselves as they wish. This is the case in all the territory occupied by the Franks upon the littoral of Syria, that is, of all the villages inhabited by the Mussulmans. The hearts of most Mussulmans are filled with the temptations of settling there, when they see the condition of their brethren in the districts governed by the Mussulmans, because the state of the latter is the reverse of comfortable.

"One of the misfortunes which afflict Mussulmans is that they have always reason for complaint, under their own government, of the injustice of their chiefs, and that they have cause only to praise the conduct of the Franks, and the justice on which one can always depend."

Undoubtedly, the Muslims were more contented, too, because the Franks sometimes employed Muslim superintendents. This same Arab traveler and William, Archbishop of Tyre, both record the fact that the herds of the Franks and of the Muslims were pastured in the same places, and that no wrong was done by either party.

The merchants were well treated in the Christian cities, the customs duties, and other taxes were not heavy; every facility was offered them. There were special quarters where they and their wares were in perfect safety; in the custom-houses they found clerks who spoke Arabic. Even in time of warfare, the merchants of either religion went and came between the hostile armies with comparative security. But because of the attempts to conquer Egypt, in the second half of the twelfth century, one of their most important sources of

commerce was closed to them. From the lament of William of Tyre we obtain a glimpse of the importance of the trade and of the way in which he regarded the situation. "Boundless greed," he complains, "has forced us violently out of the most enjoyable comfort and into a troubled and dangerous position! The treasures of Egypt and all its boundless wealth were at our service, our kingdom was secure on that side, and from the West we had no one to fear. When we wished to traverse the seas, no danger threatened us; our men could without fear and under good conditions carry on their trade with Egypt; and the Egyptians brought to us foreign riches and wholly unknown wares. Their coming always brought to us advantages and honor. In addition, the immeasurable tribute, which they paid yearly, increased both the royal treasury and also the property of individuals. But now all has turned out to our loss; the position is different and our joy has changed into grief. Wherever I turn, danger threatens us on all sides. We can no longer cross the sea in safety, every neighboring land about us belongs to the enemy, and the kingdoms which bound ours are preparing for our destruction."

The travelers among the Mohammedans had to pay what the Arabs considered a very moderate toll on entering the Christian territories. But this was not levied upon merchants, because they paid on their wares. In the period just before the capture of Jerusalem, in 1187, the most important merchant in Syria was an Arab who had his agents in all of the Christian cities. Almost all of the great industries remained in the hands of the

Syrians or Jews, while the Mediterranean commerce was in the hands of the Italians and Provençals. This again caused very intimate relations between the Christians, infidels, and Jews. How close the relations were and how early they were formed is shown by the enthusiastic words of Fulk of Chartres, who took part in this first crusade, and afterwards became a native of the Holy Land. "We men of the West have become Orientals. He who was a Roman or a Frank is now a Galilean or Palestinian. He who was from Rheims or Chartres is now a Tyrian or Antiochian. We have already forgotten the places of our birth; to most they are either unknown or unheeded. Some possess already their own houses and servants as if they had inherited them from ancestors; others have already married, and not, indeed, a woman of their own country, but a Syrian or an Armenian, sometimes even a baptized Saracen." Continuing, he says that they had acquired property so that the poor man had grown wealthy and the landless knight had become the lord of a city. The different languages were used in common by invaders and natives, and each trusted the other. He who had been a foreigner was now a native. Daily their relatives and parents were deserting all their former possessions and were following them to the Holy Land. Why should any one who had met with such good fortune in the East return to the West? God wished to make them all wealthy.

An equal toleration was shown in the matters of religion. In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Greek priests, although they were regarded as heretics, were

allowed to officiate in the services with the Latin priests. The biblical lessons were read and explained first in Latin and then in Greek. In the Norman principality of Antioch a similar policy was followed. The Greek patriarch was allowed to retain his position, and only after his death was a Latin patriarch elected. A Jacobite patriarch, although he was a heretic, was ordained by the Latin bishops. Throughout the possessions of the Franks, the Mohammedans were allowed to have mosques in Christian cities and to worship publicly.

From another source, some of the Syrians and men of other nations, especially the Jews, gained great advantage. Each Italian colony of merchants in the Frankish cities formed a Commune whose territory and members were inviolable and independent. Each administered its own affairs and used its own laws. Because of the advantages which could be gained by the employment of the natives, the consuls, who were the heads of the Communes, admitted some of them to a participation in its privileges. In this way they escaped much of the taxation and were judged by their own laws.

That the rule of the Franks, when they were firmly established, was, on the whole, just and beneficial, is attested by the Mohammedan writers. And their statements are the more worthy of credence because they testified unwillingly. In one passage they said, "May Allah curse them!"—in another they related the justice of the Franks. Ousâma told of the decision of a lawsuit by the Christians in his favor, and against their own countrymen. His autobiography is rich in examples of

the friendly relations which existed between Christian and infidel, and of the way in which the two regarded each other. Ibn Djobair also praised the justice and convenience with which all matters pertaining to commerce were administered in the Christian seaports.

The Armenians, too, lend their testimony to the excellence of the Frankish rule. When Edessa, after having been in the power of the Franks for half a century, was conquered by the Mussulmans, the lamentations of the Armenians were sincere and heartfelt. When Jerusalem was captured by Saladin, the Armenian patriarch wrote an elegy, in which he said, "God delivered Jerusalem to a pitiless enemy because of *our* sins." An even more striking proof of their attitude is furnished by the eagerness with which the Armenians in Cilicia adopted and copied the customs of the Franks. The two peoples were natural allies, as they were companions in arms against the Turks. In addition, they were both animated by a spirit of hostility towards the Greek Empire and the Greek Church. As time went by, they came nearer together; intermarriages became frequent. To notice only those which had a diplomatic significance: Arda, the granddaughter of Rhupen I., married, in 1100, Baldwin of Burg, Count of Edessa. It is evident that the Rhupenian family was not only moved by a desire for alliance with a leading member of the Frankish nobility, but also that it may have dreamed of a descendant of Rhupen ruling over ancient Armenia. Leo I. of Armenia married a sister of Baldwin of Burg. Rhupen III., brother of Leo II., married Isabella, daughter of

Humphrey, Lord of Thoron and Krak. Leo II., the first King of the new Kingdom, gave his niece in marriage to Raymond, Count of Tripolis, the eldest son of Bohemond, Prince of Antioch, and himself married Isabella, a princess of the same house. Later, he married as a second wife Sibylla, daughter of Amaury of Lusignan, King of Cyprus, and of Isabella Plantagenet, Queen of Jerusalem.

In order to assimilate his court and society more completely to the Frankish civilization, Leo borrowed many of the Western usages and customs. He introduced feudal institutions, formed a military nobility, organized his court and all the judicial and administrative services after the model of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. It was easier for him to introduce the feudal usages, because the nobles were already accustomed to similar institutions. They were bound to the chief by personal ties similar in many respects to the relations existing between a vassal and his lord in the West, and the Armenian nobles had received castles and lands to defend for their chief. The real change that was introduced was the transformation of the personal bond into a service due from the land which the noble held. How far the changes had gone is indicated in a striking manner by the letter of exhortation which St. Nerses wrote to Leo. The king wished Nerses to discard the Latin customs and to follow those of Persia, but the king himself had discarded the native costume and now wore the dress of the Franks. He had adopted the saddle and bridle of the Franks for his horse. The terms sire, constable, marshal, knight,

and liege, were used as marks of honor at the king's court. Nerses said, "Reestablish at your court the etiquette of former days and then we will change our customs." His majesty would find it repugnant to him to abandon the excellent and refined usages of the Latins, that is to say, of the Franks, and to return to the rude customs of the ancient Armenians. The king no longer let his beard grow, but shaved like a Frank. The king no longer wore the flowing garments of the Armenians, but was dressed like a Frank. "So, too," Nerses said, "we have adopted the sacerdotal ornaments of the Franks. We now pray at the third, sixth, and ninth hours as the Franks do; we now have services seven times a day as the Latin Church does; we have taken up the Latin custom in the consecration of the monks. We have seen what an excellent thing the charity of the Latin Church is, and we have adopted it; we now feed two or three hundred daily, and if your majesty will aid us we will increase the amount of our almsgiving. As we have seen that it is the custom among the Latin monasteries to have only one meal a day during half the year, we have adopted that too." Because of these details, this whole letter gives us a vivid glimpse of the manner in which the Frankish customs were being introduced and of the opposition to them.

From the native Christians in Syria, other than the Armenians, we have so few contemporary accounts that we are compelled to judge of their feelings almost wholly by negative evidence. But, in 1181, the Maronite Christians united with the Latin Church, and as a whole we

c

have very few indications that many of the Syrians were dissatisfied under the Frankish rule. Finally, the Jewish traveler, Benjamin of Tudela, who has been mentioned already, told of the prosperous condition of his co-religionists there, and gave no hint that they were suffering any persecution, such as he recorded of the Jews in the Greek Empire. A careful weighing of the testimony extant leads us to believe that the natives were well treated and well satisfied under the rule of the crusaders in the decades preceding the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin.

From the comments of Arab writers, we obtain a vivid glimpse of the constant associations between the different peoples, the feelings of the different classes, and some of the customs observed in their intercourse. Ibn Djobair, for example, speaks of the excellent police control on the Frankish side of the boundary which separated the possessions of the two. On the side of the Muslims robberies and plundering were common, on the Christian territory there was absolute security.

His description of Acre is as follows:—

“That night we stopped at one of the farmsteads, about a league distant from 'Akkah. The head man there—who was the inspector of the affairs thereof for the Muslim landlord, and on behalf of the Franks, also, for whatever the farmers did there in the matter of cultivation—invited us as guests, lodging us in a broad gallery in his house and setting food before us. We remained there that night and the next day entered 'Akkah. And they brought us to the Diwān (dogana, custom-house), which is a Khān prepared as the halting place of caravans. Before the gate is a carpeted platform on which sit the secretaries of the Diwān, on the part of

the Christians, before desks of ebony ornamented with gold work. These write in Arabic, and talk the language also, and their head is the Sâhib ad Diwân (Chief of the Customs), and they take note of all that passes before them. * * * 'Akkah is the meeting place of Muslim and Christian merchants of all lands. The place is full of pigs and crosses. * * * In the eastern part of the town is the spring called 'Ain al Bakar (the Spring of the Ox), it being that from which Allah caused the ox to come forth for Adam—peace be on him! The descent to the spring is by polished steps; and over it stands a Mosque, the Mihrâb of which remains in good condition. To the east of it the Franks have built a Mihrâb (or oratory) for themselves, and Moslems and infidels assemble together to make their prayers. But the place is in the hands of the Christians, and by them is much honored."

He found the city of Tyre cleaner. There, fortunately, he witnessed a marriage fête of which he gave a minute description:—

"All the Christian men and women present at the fête were drawn up in two lines before the bride's door. Trumpets, flutes, and all kinds of musical instruments resounded. They awaited thus the bride's departure. She appeared at length, conducted by two men who supported her on either side, who appeared to be her kinsmen. She was splendidly attired, according to their usual mode of dressing, and wore a magnificent silk robe embroidered with golden thread, whose long train swept the ground. Upon her forehead rested a diadem of gold, covered with a fillet of cloth of gold, and her bosom was adorned in the same manner. Thus clad, she advanced trippingly, with measured steps, like a turtle dove, or the dust moved by a gentle breeze. (May God preserve us from the temptations which such spectacles excite!) She was preceded by Christian magnates and followed by Christian women, who advanced mincingly, with their most beautiful ornaments trailing behind them. The procession started, the orchestra at the head; while the simple

spectators, Mussulmans and Christians, ranged themselves in two rows to be present in the march. The cortège proceeded to the house of the bridegroom, which the bride entered, and the whole company spent the day in feasting. Such was the magnificent spectacle at which chance permitted me to be present."

He says that Mohammed was cursed by the lower classes, evidently contrasting their attitude with that of the better educated, and tells of the trials from which a Moslem suffered in a Christian city. He also records the fact that Mohammedans were kept apart from Christians on board of vessels. And this leads us to observe that, although we have had so much evidence of the kindly feeling which existed between the Christians and infidels, there is a reverse side. This was voiced by Ousâma when he wrote, "Whoever has become acquainted with the Franks can do nothing but glorify and praise Allah, the all-powerful; for he has seen in them beasts who are superior in courage and in fighting but in nothing else, just as animals are superior in strength and ferocity." Yet throughout his book, this same Ousâma praised the Franks in many passages, and recorded the friendship which bound him to individual Christians. Probably such a declamatory passage as the above has little more real significance than the constantly recurring "May Allah curse them!" Nevertheless a great difference in the ideas and customs separated the two peoples and was only gradually overcome. A reflection by one of the Muslims illustrates this: "The Franks do not know the sentiment of honor, that is, jealousy. If one of them is walking with his wife and meets another man, the latter

takes the wife's hand and goes aside to talk with her, while the husband waits. If the woman prolongs the interview, the husband leaves them alone and goes away."

Naturally the Christians learned to feel a greater admiration for the Mussulmans than the latter ever felt for the Christians. And it was the most intelligent of the Christians who were most moved by this admiration for the Mohammedan civilization. William of Tyre wrote a Mohammedan history from Muslim sources as a companion volume to his history of the crusades. He frequently praised some individual among the Mussulmans and spoke in the highest terms of their valor, justice, and mercy. The enthusiasm of Frederick II. for the Muslim civilization is well-known. He adopted many of its customs, welcomed its votaries as friends, and delighted in surrounding himself with Muslim scholars. The Mohammedans were very willing to be friendly. They were so divided politically that they harbored little resentment on account of the conquests of the Christians. In fact, a Christian victory was often a cause of joy to some Muslim princes, who saw a hated foe vanquished. As a consequence many friendships were formed between individuals. Besides the examples given above, we may note that Baldwin I. had many friends among the Arab nobles; that Humphrey of Toron and one of the emirs of Nur ed-din were intimate companions. Raymond III. of Tripoli and Saladin had formed such a close friendship that the latter aided Raymond against the King of Jerusalem.

When all of the Christian knights were summoned to repel the forces of Saladin, just before the battle of Hattin, Raymond was distrusted by many because they feared that his friendship with Saladin would lead him to betray the cause of the Christians. Even his noble conduct did not wholly dispel this suspicion. Count Joscelin restored all the booty which he had captured from a caravan, when he found that it belonged to Arabs with whom he had formerly been on friendly relations. The friendship of Richard the Lion-Hearted and Saladin, which has been depicted in romantic form by Sir Walter Scott, caused many to believe Richard unfaithful to the Christian cause.

The absence of hatred in the minds of the more intelligent is shown by the praises which the authors of both faiths bestow upon the most dreaded leaders of the opponents. William of Tyre says of Saladin that he was a man prudent in council, valiant in arms, exceedingly generous. Of Nur ed-din, he says, "He was the greatest persecutor of the Christian name and faith, but nevertheless a just prince, resourceful and prudent." Of the Mohammedans, in general, the medieval monk, Ricoldus, says, at a later period, "Who is not astounded if he considers diligently the very great zeal of the Saracens for study, their devotion in prayer, their mercy to the poor, their reverence for the name of God and of the prophet and for the holy places, their uprightness in morals, their affability to foreigners, their harmony and love among themselves?" Similar passages in praise of Count Raymond of Agiles, King Fulk, Bohemond I.,

and other leaders of the Christians might be quoted from Arabic sources.

Many courtesies were interchanged between the two. This was especially true of the time of the third crusade. "Messengers were continually going back and forth bringing little gifts from Saladin to King Richard." Saladin sent to Richard the Lion-Hearted and Philip Augustus horses, ice, and fruits from the gardens of Damascus, especially during the illness of the English king. They, in turn, sent to him costly jewels, hunting dogs, and falcons. Saladin excelled all others in his mercy, toleration, and courtesy. At the conquest of Jerusalem he spared the citizens. After the conquest he allowed churches to be retained by the Christians, and priests to officiate. He sent Muslim singers to Richard. In the midst of battle he found time to restore a baby of three months to its Christian mother from whom it had been stolen. Even after the slaughter of the Saracens at Acre by Richard, Saladin refused to take vengeance on the pilgrims who came into his power. Instead he protected them, gave them presents, and conversed affably with them about the affairs in England. The Templars became especially intimate with the Mohammedans and allowed the latter to pray in the chapels attached to the strongholds which they occupied. Frederick II., in the following century, was distinguished for the courteous treatment which he accorded to all Mussulmans.

During several periods, it seemed probable that the Christians and infidels might attain a position in which it was possible for them to live side by side in peace.

Even Innocent III., in writing to Saphadin proposed, in 1214, that both parties should release their captives and live in peace.

In conclusion, it is necessary to indicate briefly the causes of the check given in 1187, and of the final destruction of the promising Christian colonies. The great and ever present obstacle which prevented the success of the crusaders as colonists, and a cordial association between the two peoples, was the fanaticism of the war-party among the Franks, and especially of the newcomers. For there were always two parties in the Latin Kingdom; one wished to wage incessant war against the infidel, the other desired to maintain peace with the Mussulmans and to live on terms of friendship with the natives. The latter was generally more powerful, as has been indicated above, but at any time it was possible that some rash act of an adventurer might precipitate a general war. Such was the fatal attack upon the Saracen caravan made by Reginald of Châtillon, which aroused Saladin to vengeance, which caused the capture of Jerusalem, which led to the third crusade.

For a few years both crusaders and Mussulmans were thoroughly aroused. Cruel and bloody deeds, such as the slaughter of the Muslim captives at Acre, embittered the minds of the contestants. But even these had little or no lasting effect. After the departure of Richard the Lion-Hearted from the Holy Land, and after the death of Saladin, religious enthusiasm died out on both sides and the position of the Christians improved. The latter gradually regained many of their former pos-

sessions. Cordial relations were reestablished. It seemed probable that the Frankish colonies would again prosper and that the fusion of the various races would continue. By the diplomatic crusade of Frederick II., the holy city itself was restored to the Christians, and the Moham-medans were closely associated with them in many mutual interests. In spite of the opposition which his conduct aroused on the part of the patriarch and clergy, most of the Franks acquiesced in his arrangements, because they realized that friendly relations with the Muslim princes were essential to their prosperity.

But, in 1244, one of the great inundations of a barbarous race from the interior of Asia swept over Palestine and Syria. Everywhere it wrought ruin and destruction. For a time, the Franks were able to hold the walled cities, especially those on the seacoast, but gradually their position became untenable, and they were compelled to withdraw from the Holy Land. After an existence of nearly two centuries the last of the Frankish colonies was destroyed.

**THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
OF WESTERN EUROPE UNDER THE
INFLUENCE OF THE CRUSADES**



PROFESSOR HANS PRUTZ



THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF WEST-
ERN EUROPE UNDER THE INFLUENCE
OF THE CRUSADES



ISTORY'S conception and judgment of the crusades have undergone in the course of time many highly characteristic changes. Even contemporaries assumed towards the beginning and the progress of these great folk-movements very different attitudes, determined by their own spiritual and intellectual tendencies; by the point of view from which they observed events, they interested themselves in one or the other aspect of them, and accordingly, in a greater or less degree, allowed their discernment free play. In the anonymous author of the "Gesta Francorum," a knight in the train of Bohemund of Tarentum, we have with regard to the first crusade an informant who did not, enthusiastic though he was for the God-inspired holy war, lose sympathy with the things of this world,—who observed them rather with kindly impartiality and described them vividly and distinctly. On the other hand, the Provençal Raymond of Aiguilles, writing also as an eye-witness, displays that overwrought spiritual state that caused the hot-blooded natives of

Southern France surrounding the Count of Toulouse and Bishop Adhamar of Puy to become, with their blind faith in miracles and their unreasoning hatred of unbelievers, representatives of the wildest fanaticism. Later, the papal court, looking after its own interests and regarding such a point of view as eminently favorable to its own spiritual supremacy, endorsed and upheld it, with the result that subsequent accounts of the crusades came to be ever more and more at variance with historical truth. We know how William of Tyre, though free because of his birth in Palestine from many erroneous notions that beset Occidental historians of the crusades, yet made important concessions to this as it were official position of the Church. Even he, a man of education, possessed of sound judgment and of the historic sense, ascribed to the miraculous in the course of this religious war, which he likewise wished to regard as divinely inspired, a far greater influence than would seem to be consistent with a mode of thinking so enlightened as his.

Thus it came about that the centuries immediately succeeding more and more lost sight of the real character of the crusades, and looked at them through a thick veil of poetry and saga, of legend and myth. Of the real significance of these movements to whose ascendancy they had so completely yielded, they possessed but the faintest conception. Not until later did the reaction occur that opposed to the exaggerated misrepresentation of the crusades, from the point of view of the Church, an equally one-sided, equally overdrawn picture of them from that of the enlightened eighteenth century. The

champions of Rationalism neither realized how important the mediæval Church had been to the history of the world, nor what beneficent influences had proceeded from it, despite the many errors and inexcusable misrepresentations for which it later became responsible. They identified the Church of the eighteenth century, degenerate, pope-ridden, a foe alike to progress and to culture, with the institution of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. Having before their eyes as they did a Church dominated by papal selfishness and priestly deceit, they considered the crusades, which, without understanding, they regarded as the greatest triumph of those qualities, to be the outcome of a state of spiritual darkness, of monkish craft directed toward mere worldly advantage. Still another change in the estimate of the crusades followed in the time of the Restoration, when mediæval civilization came once more into favor, and when, in science as well as in literature, men inclined to the view that the Western races had never attained a higher grade, and a more harmonious development, of the spiritual and intellectual life than during the brief flowering period of the Middle Ages. The splendor of Romanticism, in which the crusades were just then bathed, exercised a magic power over the minds of men who, after the horrors of a revolution now decried as infidel, sought peace and repose in the contemplation of a period when every nation seemed to bend all its energies to the attainment of exclusively religious ends.

It was modern historical investigation that first reached a juster point of view from which to treat this body of

material, which possesses particular significance in that it has to do, not simply with one of the Western nations, but with all of them. Unseduced by the splendidly iridescent glory of its mere outward aspect, we can now let our glance penetrate into the very real, indeed partly material, relations that, reinforced by intellectual and especially by religious motives, directed the movement of the Occidental peoples back toward the East, determining at the same time its course and the character of its results. Bewildering and disheartening must seem to every serious student the long series of adventurous struggles that were so often carried on to little purpose, and that during two centuries enticed ever new bodies of men of all nations over the sea (*ultra mare, d'outre mer*), only to find for the greater part of them unprofitable graves. Must not one, contemplating the spectacle they present, be inclined to agree with the writers of the eighteenth century who refused to see in the crusades anything save a confirmation, in the grand style, of human folly, if they really served no other purpose than to free the West repeatedly from its burden of overpopulation, to afford an opportunity for the perfection of the art of war, and to set on foot a deadly and age-long feud between two religions that might have existed side by side in peace and friendship, despite the original and irreconcilable contradictions that had been brought out in earlier times, and whose followers might have been of assistance to each other in many ways, and thus have helped to elevate mankind?

The importance of the crusades for universal history,

however, does not consist in the long series of military happenings of which they seem to be made up. It lies rather in the great work of peace and civilization that, in the midst of passionate national and religious quarrels, was accomplished through common interest and mutual exchange on the part of bitterly struggling enemies, and that provided an essentially new basis for the entire development of the West. Only a study of mediæval civilization pursued from the standpoint of economics can do justice to this most fruitful page in the history of the crusades.

In what follows, an attempt will be made to present, with the aid of recent investigation, a picture of what may be considered the outcome of these wars, a picture embracing those permanent influences that they, though ending as regards their object in complete failure, nevertheless exerted upon the economic life of Western Europe. So the preliminary warning must not be omitted that we are to deal with processes that escaped, even when going on, the observation of the sharpest sighted men of the time; that are consequently discussed in none of our sources, and in the great majority of instances are to be detected only through their results. That we may, in any particular case, avoid making mistakes while establishing such primary relations, which are not capable of definite proof, but which can only be discovered, or indeed conjectured, from that which came later, it will be necessary to begin somewhat farther off, and to get some idea of the means and of the routes employed in an exchange of civilization such as that

D

with which we are concerned, and to sketch the way in which friendly or unfriendly intercourse affected, in the first place, the Western Christians and the followers of Islam, and, in the second, through them their countrymen at home.

In this connection, immediate contact between man and man or nation and nation comes far less into consideration than one would be inclined to think. We have more to do with the half-unconscious persistence of impressions made by foreign countries upon those who had fortunately returned to their own people from the adventurous journey to the distant Orient, and who lived out their lives under conditions long familiar to them. Those who acted as what we might call the transmitting agents of civilization between the West and the East, and by means of whom the crusades exercised so momentous an influence upon the economic development of Europe, were not at first those adventurers who after fulfilling their crusading vow settled in the Orient for the purpose of acquiring reasonable fortunes, in no way corresponding to their hopes, but rather those persons who resumed their home life after a longer or shorter stay beyond the sea, took pattern by some new thing learned in foreign lands, and turned their experiences to good account, or related them for the satisfaction of neighborly curiosity.

Howsoever strange this statement may seem, it is substantiated by the fact that the reaction of Eastern culture upon that of Western Europe began long before any numbers of those who had settled and become at

home on the Syrian coast returned to their native lands, recognizing the impossibility of holding their possessions as a Christian colony. Moreover, it is confirmed by another fact, namely, that the number of those who did at length return to their homes, now become alien, must have been so small that we should not be justified in asserting that they transmitted stimuli affecting civilization so deeply or so persistently. In order that an influence that was gradually to extend so far and to affect so deeply all classes should be exerted, there was need of long persisting and regularly recurring transmission. Such an influence could come into existence only through an intercourse between West and East astonishing in its extent, an intercourse that covered a generation and that led untold thousands belonging to the West European races to make a temporary sojourn in the Orient, and then to return, with what new ideas and impressions they had there acquired, to take up life under the old conditions.

It is a mistake to think that the people of Western Europe were in the Middle Ages more settled, and so less migratory, than they are today. If we take into consideration their smaller numbers, we shall incline rather to the opinion that they were more unquiet, more fond of wandering than are the Europeans of the present time. It would be difficult, for instance, to overestimate the amount of travel that went on between the Christian states in the Holy Land and the Western part of Europe. This assertion is supported by what approximate estimates we are able to form of the travel that

passed through the Italian seaports, though, to be sure, these do not enable us to make any exact calculations as to numbers. At the same time, in no estimate, of course, can we take account of the unbroken ranks of those that strove to reach the same goal by means of the overland route through Hungary, Servia, and Greece, or that took ship from the Atlantic coast, from the Netherlands and Flanders, on the one hand, on the other from Norway, or that, starting even from the Baltic, sailed around the Spanish Peninsula and through the Straits of Gibraltar. Twice yearly did the stream of crusaders and pilgrims, as well as of those whom commercial or other reasons compelled eastward, gather volume and become a sort of folk-movement. In spring, at Eastertide, and again about the time of the summer solstice, there took place from the coast cities of Italy, and particularly from Venice, a general passage or transmigration of the bands that had assembled from distant countries. So twice yearly many thousands were carried over to the coast of Palestine in large vessels that were specially adapted to transporting weapons, and the fitting out of which proved so profitable to the ship-owners of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa as well as to those of Amalfi and Marseilles, that even the Knights of St. John and those of the Temple allowed their galleys to be employed in a similar way to their own pecuniary advantage. At other times of the year, to be sure, similar voyages were made, but the numbers of those taking part in them were much smaller. We should think of this whole carrying system, making possible such an almost continuous folk-movement, as

partaking quite of the character of those arrangements that are now made in the interest of emigrants from the Old World to the New. The only essential difference between them consists in the fact that in the former the religious character of the transmarine expedition was steadfastly maintained, even though the travelers, despite their wearing of the Red Cross, at one time the almost universal custom, were bent upon mere worldly business. For the Cross assured them the enjoyment of a number of advantages that were of assistance to those making their way eastward in fulfillment of a vow. A greater degree of hospitality was accorded them; they might, in cases of necessity, obtain the protection of one of the orders of knights, besides having a claim to lodgings in the houses or stations established by charity for the accommodation of pilgrims.

A distinctly international character distinguished the travel that proceeded from the Italian seaports, particularly as regards Venice and Genoa. Yet by far the greater number of the South and Middle Italians went east from Pisa, Amalfi, and Bari, just as Marseilles and Aigues-Mortes formed the principal starting-points for pilgrims from Southern France and the regions beyond. Toward the end of the period of the crusades, however, when the constantly unsettled state of Italy made dangerous the roads that lead to the Italian seacoast, Marseilles seems to have acquired the foremost place in this intercourse between West and East. We learn incidentally that about 1246, in the ships belonging to the Knights of St. John and the Templars alone, there went

to sea from this port no fewer than six thousand pilgrims yearly. If we consider that, as the result of a suit that the ship-owners of Marseilles instituted, on the ground of unlawful competition, against both these orders, and that was pressed before the papal court, they were forbidden to make use of more than four ships in this way, are we not compelled to believe that the total number of the travelers who from Marseilles alone passed over into Palestine must have amounted to some multiple of this six thousand? And this at a time, too, when the ruling conditions beyond sea had lost much of their power of attraction, when, in other words, the volume of the stream of travel thither had, in comparison with earlier times, greatly diminished.

No figures denoting just how large these crowds passing back and forth from country to country may have become, can of course be given. Nevertheless, the various computations to be found in our sources justify us in assuming that the total number of those that took part in this movement must have been very great, even when one takes into consideration, as one should, the fact that estimates made by mediæval writers are always to be suspected, and must be somewhat reduced: only large figures were capable of making any impression upon the blunt senses of the men of that time. At any rate, what we are told of the numbers that every year sailed to Palestine from the port of Marseilles on transports belonging to two religious orders alone, is substantially confirmed by mentioning incidentally the fact that a ship, wrecked in 1182 on the Egyptian coast near Damietta,

carried as passengers no fewer than 1,500 pilgrims; again, when in 1180 several vessels also carrying pilgrims met a similar fate near the same place, 2,500 persons were drowned, and more than 1,600 fell captive to the Mohammedans. We are told further that the Mohammedan pirates ^{who} ~~that~~ from Beirut on lay in wait for the pilgrim-ships as they sailed down the coast, took prisoners and sold into slavery 14,000 Christians in only a few years. More such statements might easily be adduced. With whatever degree of caution we may make use of them, they are sufficient, when taken in connection with what has been previously brought forward, to justify us in making definite assertions. Looking at the thousands upon thousands that, during the crusades, whether as pilgrims, religious warriors, or what not, streamed back and forth each year between Syria and Palestine and the seaports of Southern and Western Europe, and so created what might be called a small folk-migration, we may safely assert that at that time, aside from the crusades themselves, from the large war-like expeditions that were periodically set on foot, there went on uninterruptedly an active and peaceful binding together of Western Europe and Western Asia. By this means, there was supplied to the former a number of new culture elements that were unconsciously assimilated, and so altered and extended her economic relations.

The immediately economic influences exerted by the crusades upon the development of Western Europe withdraw themselves, in the course of their development, almost without exception from our notice, and only in

occasional instances is it possible to determine the way in which this or that new thing became known to the Occident. We should consequently be careful whether we ascribe to any one of the races that took part in the intercourse a particularly important part in the transmission of civilization; we should hesitate even in the case of the French and the Italians, who, as regards mere numbers, outshone all other nations, and consequently had the largest and richest share in that hybrid or composite culture that came into existence among the motley Western crowds composing the population of Palestine, who had received throughout the East the name of Franks, and who became a bond of union between Oriental and Occidental, Mohammedan and Christian civilization. In considering the immediate effect upon the West of its contact with Oriental ideas, we are accordingly interested chiefly in the question of how well acquainted the people of Europe were with Eastern products, tools, and articles of use generally, or of how rapid was the introduction of those that hitherto had been brought into the West only occasionally or in small quantities, and that passed into general use at this time, though they had hitherto been rare and costly. This process, having to do with the history of civilization is for us recognizable chiefly through its linguistic precipitate. For the Franks and the Occidental nations interested in the European colonies in Syria took over the Arabic name when they took over the thing, and consequently the words borrowed in this fashion by the Western languages make it possible for us to find out, with

tolerable exactness, wherein their indebtedness to the East lay.

Some at least of the groups of words and ideas that concern us here may be readily brought to mind. Arabic expressions adopted by all the Western languages occur in the terminology of commerce and of the sea, by which both civilizations were brought into the closest and most enduring contact. It is necessary to cite only such words as *bazar*, *baracke*, *fondaco* (from the Arabic *funduk*, itself derived from the Greek *πυλῶν*), *zecca*, *zecchine*, and *dinero*, besides *tarif*, *dogana*, *douane* (from *diwan*); further, *admiral* and *arsenal*, as well as expressions like *kalfatern* (*gulafa*), the appellation *carraca* for a fire-ship, *kabal*, *korvette*, and many others. Yet more numerous are such borrowings as the names of parts of domestic appliances and furniture, for example, *alkoven*, (Arabic *alcubba*, Spanish *alcoba*), which appears again in French as *ancube* and in German as *Ekub*, *amulet*, *talisman*, *elixir*, *salep*, and the names of certain musical instruments native to the Orient (such as even *die Laute*, Arabic *aloud*, French *luth*, Italian *liudo*, Spanish *laude*, Portuguese *alaude*).

A third group is composed of those Arabic words that became known in the West together with the natural products designated by them. To this group belongs the sesame, employed in Syria particularly for the preparation of oil, and the originally Arabic name of which, *la jugeoline*, was adopted in the West at the same time with the cultivation of the grain itself. The same thing took place in the case of the carob tree, the Arabic

name of which, *karubla*, was taken into French in the form of *caroubier*, into Spanish as *garrobo*. So with saffron, with maize and rice, and with sugar, which last, although previously known, yet came into general use in consequence of the intercourse brought about by the crusades, and then, for the first time, began to play an important part in the domestic life of Western Europe. Certain sorts of fruit in particular became then first known in Europe, such as the pistache and the lemon, as well as the apricot, not infrequently called the Damascus plum, and the little onions now known as *échalottes*, though originally called *Ascalonettes*, that is, onions from Askalon, a name which the Italians have corrupted into *scalogno*, and the Germans into *Eschlauch* and *Aschlauch*. Finally, there is the watermelon, which has acquired such great importance as a food for all the peoples of Southeastern Europe, and which is called after the Italian fashion *anguria*, a Greek word brought from Byzantium, whereas the French give it the name of *pastèque*, taken from the Arabic, a fact that makes plain the manner in which the communication brought about by the crusades between West and East struck out for itself paths entirely unconnected with one another, along which these processes of exchange took place.

Besides bringing the Western nations acquainted with these natural products, the commercial relations engendered by the crusades made known to them many new kinds of manufactures and other productions of Oriental industry, or made what had been hitherto with difficulty attainable to be had easily and commonly. This process can also

be traced with greatest certainty through the influence it exerted upon language. For example, the word *coton*, employed by the Romance language as a name for cotton, is of Arabian origin (*al-koton*), and corresponds to the fact that the material made out of it, which we still call cotton, coming from Syria, passed into general use throughout the entire West as a result of the commercial intercourse brought about by the crusades. A similar connection is to be observed in the case of muslin, brought from the Mosul, and of a finely woven cloth called *bucaranum*, which came from Bokhara. By the word *baldachin* was originally signified a costly stuff brought from Baldach, i. e., Bagdad, and not until later was it applied to the kind of ornamental furniture that it suggests to our ears, and which is covered with the same material. A rich and brilliant tissue brought from Damascus was known to commerce as damask; others derive the word from a stem that means something like "brilliantly woven," and assert that the noble capital of the Omayyads had its own name from the same source. Great importance, moreover, attached to the Syrian industries of silkworm culture and of silk-weaving, whose flourishing condition and great productivity assured to the various silk-stuffs, which had hitherto been held at extraordinarily high prices, a wide and varied use in Western Europe, so that they came to form a considerable part of the clothing of the upper classes. This is particularly true of the material called atlas, which was woven out of silk after a special method—the word means, in the first place, smooth, beardless, and, in the second, a particu-

larly smooth, non-fibrous silk tissue,—and also of what was called sammet, the production of which was peculiar to Constantinople, and which was spread thence over the West by means of the crusades. Under their influence, furthermore, the carpet-weaving industry of the Occident flourished extremely, for it received a great stimulus through the new models brought from the East, and it imitated the patterns and colors that were there in especial favor, besides employing the methods of dyeing in use among the Oriental weavers. This practice of imitation is well illustrated by the fact that the French weavers, of whom in the time of Philip II. (1180–1223) there were already a considerable number, were called “sarrasinois,” and that by the words “tapis sarrasinois” was understood a carpet somewhat like sammet, and woven after the Oriental fashion.

✓ Some of these borrowings from the Orient, which not only revealed to the inhabitants of Europe many new customs, but also brought into existence among them new wants, though at the same time supplying the ways and means to their satisfaction, appear as unsought and quite natural results of the settling in Palestine of peoples of Western origin who maintained relations with their home countries. At the same time, other borrowings not only presuppose a connection with the Orient of this peculiarly personal character, but can have been accomplished only gradually, and by means of an intercourse prosecuted continuously for generations, an intercourse having its roots in a commerce firmly established, and consequently carried on in regular channels, that was

conditioned by the economic relations of the countries taking part in it, just as it conditioned itself those same relations. It was precisely in these respects that the crusades exercised over the nations of Western Europe a particularly momentous influence, and thereby created, in many ways, entirely new conditions, under which the economic relations of these countries were further developed.

Even before the crusades began, the commercial relations between the Occident and the Orient had become very close, though they had had to encounter many obstacles and difficulties. After the Seljuk Turks became masters of Palestine, intercourse with the seaports of that country greatly decreased. The old paths of communication were closed in large part, and the only route that could be substituted for them was a roundabout one through Egypt. Furthermore, the people of Byzantium endeavored to restrict as much as possible the competition of the Italian cities, which they did not relish, and consequently, now on political, now on religious pretexts, put hindrances in the way of commerce. This state of affairs became changed after the first crusade, when Western Christianity gained a firm foothold in Palestine and the neighboring country of Syria, and had been able to establish against the heathen a sort of common frontier. In this the French and Italians took the lead, of whom the former bore bravely the burden of the unceasing religious warfare, while the latter, trading both on land and sea, played the chief part in laying the foundation for the economic future of

the colony. None of the other nations of Western Europe, however, failed to bear its share in this task, though they were not so numerous represented. There were to be found Spaniards,—especially Catalans, and in greatest numbers those from Barcelona,—Flemish, Lothringians, and besides, though to be sure in smaller numbers, Germans, Scandinavians, English, Irish, Scotch, and Hungarians. Not only did the commerce carried on by Europe with these colonies assume extremely large proportions, but it gave rise to a great many new trade relations that made accessible markets hitherto out of reach, or that brought them closer, and then opened up beyond large districts in which commerce could be carried on. Traders went from Palestine to the Mohammedan “Hinterland” on business that brought them into very close touch with the inhabitants of those regions, and did not allow themselves to be deterred from their profitable toil by the threats of punishment launched by the Church against those who engaged in a traffic with the unbelievers. Such a traffic the Church believed to be hurtful to herself, fearing as she did that in this way the Saracens might obtain more easily, and in larger quantities, the means wherewith to prosecute the war against the Christians. For, besides importing into their own lands Oriental products, the Occidental merchants that were carrying on business in the East exported large quantities of the superfluous products of Europe to the colonies, and then sent them farther on into the more distant Mohammedan countries. The colonists, when it came to supplying their needs, were compelled to rely

chiefly upon the mother country and the assistance that she afforded them. The stately fleets that twice yearly sailed from Europe to the Syrian harbors were heavily laden with supplies. Among them the most prominent place was naturally occupied by those things that had to do with the warfare against the heathen, which the Church, misunderstanding the actual state of affairs, continued to regard as the special business of the Christian colonists, and of the reinforcements that they were constantly receiving from the West. Consequently, in the commerce of Western Europe the exporting of weapons, armor, and horses to the lands settled by the crusaders played a very considerable part,—a part that was all the more considerable, doubtless, because under the conditions that then existed there was at all times a great demand for these things in Europe itself. Further, there was exported to Palestine whatever cloth the Franks dwelling there needed for their garments, and in this trade Lombardy and Flanders were particularly prominent. By far the most important of all, however, was the importation of grain. As regards the grain produced in the colonies, it was by no means sufficient to sustain their population, particularly at a later time, when the territory under control of the Christians became ever smaller, and the almost incessant petty warfare with the Mahommedans rendered it impossible to cultivate the soil. We can hardly give an exhaustive list of the other things that were sent out to the crusaders. The motherland had to provide a multitude of necessary articles of all sorts, which custom and habit had made

indispensable, even in a foreign country, alike to traveler, pilgrim, and crusader, and the lack of which none of them knew how to supply. Among other things, there were great numbers of pictures of saints, for which, as we should expect, there was a very great demand, and in Jerusalem itself these much desired objects found a special market.

We are not, indeed, in a position to say which of the West European countries supplied any one of the above named articles whereof the settlers of Palestine stood in need, and which of them was influenced in its particularly economic relations by this trade. We are more fully acquainted with the influence that the introduction of Oriental products and manufactures into the Occident exerted upon certain of the Western nations. We can trace out minutely the process whereby the large stream of importations from the East, after entering Europe, became diverted into ever more numerous smaller branches that supplied the various markets, just as we can see how, in consequence of this process, there slowly grew up, in connection with the chief centres of distribution, centres of the second, third, and fourth rank, at which was stored the stock of Oriental goods destined to supply particular districts, and from which these goods were sold to the consumer in the ordinary course of retail trade. In this manner, there came into existence very well defined commercial highways, so to speak, as well as regularly recurring fairs, and the whole course of commerce was carried on in such a way that labor and risk were lessened for both seller and con-

sumer; profitable trading was made easy, and special commercial customs grew up, which after remaining in force for some time developed into rigid commercial rules.† It must be admitted, however, that the peoples and countries of Western Europe did not share alike in this evolutionary process, and that the influence exercised by the crusades upon the different nations varied accordingly.

Generally speaking, even as early as the period of the crusades, the chief part of the trade between West and East passed through the Italian seaports. The merchants of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa handled by far the most of the imported Oriental goods. The next place was held, then as now, by the people of Southern France. For all of these, but especially for the Venetians, this trade became a source of wealth, all the more inexhaustible because they not only supplied the entire demand of Italy itself, which was very considerable, but also in the capacity of middle-men traded with the countries lying immediately to the north, and through them distributed the products of the Orient among the other nations of Europe. Venice and Genoa, in particular, were the marts from which these goods were sent over the Alps into Germany, and thence still farther into the North and East. Even those goods that reached the region of the Middle and Lower Danube seem not to have been brought upstream from the neighboring kingdom of Byzantium, but to have been sent over the Alps, and then down the river from Regensburg. The starting-point of this entire distributory process was the "Fon-
E

daco dei Tedeschi" in Venice, where the traders of Regensburg, Nürnberg, Augsburg, Ulm, Constance, and other German cities not only stored products of German industry with a view to sending them to the East, but also purchased spices, coloring matter, silk-stuffs, and so on for the home demand. The merchant princes of Nürnberg pursued this particular traffic in what might be called the grand style; at the same time, they brought many Eastern products from Genoa, which was a city much visited by the tradesmen of Upper Germany in particular. Through Genoa, moreover, the products of the Levant penetrated to France; at least she outstripped in this branch of trade, all the other Italian cities, active as they were in prosecuting it. Thus we find most of them represented at the crowded marts of Champagne, while, toward the end of the period of the crusades, Nîmes obtained the chief place in this international commercial intercourse, without, however, being able to maintain itself in this position. At the same time, direct communication with the East was maintained by the cities of Southern France, especially by Marseilles, as has been already mentioned, and even by some of the cities situated inland, such as Montpellier. On the other hand, the trade between the Orient and the Netherlands, whose wool fabrics were also exported to Palestine, remained almost entirely in the hands of the Italians, although the sailors of the Lower Rhine had repeatedly taken part in the crusades, and had consequently been over the direct route from their own ports to the East. Italian merchants went from the markets

of Champagne into the neighboring Netherlands, and there bartered Eastern wares, such as spices, coloring matters, and silk cloth for woolen goods. Later, Venice, and Genoa as well, maintained a regular intercourse with the Dutch ports, which served at the same time to introduce into Spain the materials that the Italians had brought with them from the Orient. Even the English markets were partly supplied in this way by the Italians. For although there was an English quarter (*Vicus Anglorum*) in Acon, yet we have no evidence going to show that the English settled there maintained regularly a direct intercourse with the mother country. The Italian galleys bound for the Netherlands, however, frequently put in at English ports. At the same time, the Germans, starting out from the Lower Rhine, and especially from Cologne, carried on a very active trade with England, and in particular with London, where, as is well known, the Hanse Steelyard was later very prominent commercially. The Germans, moreover, supplied England with spices that they had themselves brought from Genoa and Venice.

Of course, a commerce that dealt in such a multitude of articles of the most various sorts, that embraced so many countries, and that assumed a truly international character in consequence of its manifold divisions and subdivisions, in short, that was for its time a world-commerce, in the strict sense of the word, could not consent to remain cramped by the naturally evolved usages of a process of barter, however highly developed that process may have been. It was compelled to devise a means of

exchange that could be employed in the settlement of accounts, that is, that could be transported from place to place, and whereby could be overcome not only the obstacles that time and space put in the way of commerce, but also could be avoided those dangers that grew out of uncertain means of communication and long and difficult journeys. Quite frequently, it was a matter of sums that, for the time, were extraordinarily large and that no man could carry with him by reason of their weight alone. Some process had to be devised whereby debits and credits could be made to balance without the necessity of transporting hither and thither large quantities of the precious metals. In this respect, the crusades brought about a fundamental change in previously existing conditions, and thus opened for the economic development of Western Europe, in particular, an entirely new era.

To be sure, at the time when the great eastward movement of the Western peoples began, the transition from a basis of barter to one of exchange by means of money had been everywhere begun, and here and there had progressed to a considerable extent: it was completed and made general by the crusades and by the growth of commerce brought about by them. At the same time, as a result of the international character of this commerce, the trade in money had also become international, and a system by which accounts could be settled and exchanges made had developed; the fundamental principles of which have continued to maintain themselves, and proved in addition so capable of extension and

improvement that they could be adopted into the exchange system devised by later centuries. Though we should not be justified in regarding the pilgrims and crusaders of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries precisely in the light of inventors of letters of credit and exchange, yet it was certainly they that gave to these commercial contrivances, up to that time but little used, a very great practical value, and thereby provided Western Europe, the economic development of which had already been considerable, with a new means of commercial growth, one that was theoretically very simple, and yet in practice accomplished astonishing results. It was at that time, not simply during the crusades, but as an actual result of them and of the commerce that they had called into being, that money became a power, we might almost say a world-power.

From the very first, the crusades necessitated the carrying about of unusually large sums of money. For though among the pilgrims there must always have been some who, in a state of absolute poverty, begged their way to their pious goal, thinking thereby to have fulfilled their vow in a way especially pleasing to God, yet the crusaders, and in general those making their way to the Holy Land, had to provide beforehand the money that was to pay for lodgings and defray the expenses of travel and transportation. Rarely did it happen that a man of ordinary station in life did not have to sell or mortgage some part at least of his real estate or of his moveables, while the landowner of rank borrowed money for the same purpose from the neighboring abbeys and cloisters.

Princes, in order to obtain the necessary sums, which were often very considerable, were compelled frequently to carry on extensive business transactions, besides having to devise ways how they might carry with them their supplies of money in the shape of coin, so that they might be able, even in a foreign land, to pay each of their men the sum due him, however small it might be. Consequently, they usually carried the requisite amounts with them in the form of specie, the transportation of which was rendered comparatively safe by the warlike character of the expedition. The individual pilgrim, however, and the knight who did not travel with a large army to make war on the unbelievers preferred to take letters of credit instead of ready money. These letters of credit were of several sorts, among which the least frequent were letters of exchange, though to be sure we know of instances in which they were employed. The simple letters of credit, of which a great many have come down to us, were worded in various ways. Sometimes wealthy men, priests or laymen, gave one or more knights going to the Holy Land credit upon their account up to a certain sum; frequently protecting themselves against loss by exacting from those who received the letters, mortgages to an equivalent amount upon their real or personal property. It is to be understood, of course, that the money-lender or supplier of credit invariably tried to see to it in such transactions that the danger that he always ran was balanced by a profit correspondingly high. This he did at first by exacting a high rate of interest. Against such practices the Church to be sure

labored zealously, and threatened with excommunication all those that indulged in them. Yet, as was to be expected, the power of actual economic conditions was greater than that of the commands of the Church and of the bulls launched by the Pope in their support. Moreover they were easily circumvented; the Church's curse upon usury was avoided in the case of such irregular transactions in this way, that the rate of interest was not specified, but the total sum to which the interest would amount was added to the principal, of which the debtor had to acknowledge the receipt.

Without doubt business transactions of this character were very common in themselves. By virtue of the frequency of their occurrence, however, they exercised upon the money trade everywhere a powerful influence, and occasioned economic changes of a fundamental character. Inasmuch as a very considerable number of the many thousands that took part in the two regular biennial voyages to the East had to provide the means necessary to the journey in some way or another, the sum total of these various business transactions amounted to something tremendous, and money was circulated to an extent hitherto unprecedented; furthermore, this system of exchange was profitable, and thereby exerted a determining influence upon the economic life of the Western part of Europe in all of its aspects. Naturally the importance and the commercial power of those in whose hands this money trade was held increased greatly, so that they were not only able to adjust and regulate the course of commerce in general, but were also able to

control it absolutely, upon occasion, and determine it according to their own will and judgment. This was done most by the Italian bankers, and especially by those of Genoa, Pisa, and Sienna, who had their offices and correspondents placed for this purpose in all the principal cities of Cyprus, Syria, and Egypt. They formed themselves into corporations, and guaranteed to supply Western princes going on a crusade with the necessary sums of money, and to have them ready in the proper instalments at certain previously designated points. These princes were accustomed to have their regular bankers, who undertook once for all the management of their affairs; and, as a result, we are constantly encountering the same names in the papers and documents relating to these matters. On account of her geographical position, Italy became, in the course of this traffic, as it were, the classic land of banking. The famous Genoese financiers, Catoni, Domenici, Amadeo, Farigo, Pancia, Perujji, Scali, Acciajoli, Bardi, Ammanati, as well as others, were particularly prominent, and had their offices in Acon, Jaffa, Cæsarea, Tripoli, and elsewhere. A similar rank was held in Pisa by the Conti and the Vermigli, in Sienna by the Rosso Consiglio, and in Florence by the Spittatti. The Lambertucci di Frescobaldi, likewise of Florence, maintained direct business communication with Northern Germany. In Sienna, in the time of Louis IX. of France, there was a great company of financiers, who extended their commercial relations throughout Italy, France, and Palestine, and

the chief among whom, Roland Bonseigneur, was banker to Clement IV., who held him in great regard.

All this seems to us modern in an extraordinary degree. The financial transactions carried on by princes bound for the crusades with these corporations, or with firms capable of affording the necessary assistance, remind us strikingly of the way in which loans are now made. Closely connected with the monetary transactions of this nature were those between East and West, which no longer, as a rule, necessitated the transportation hither and thither of sums of ready money, but which were carried on by means of orders and letters of exchange, and by the balancing of debit and credit, and in which the orders of knights took a very important part. The Hospitallers particularly, in the interest of the finances of their own order, entered into business relations with the merchants and bankers of Southern France, who not only sent to the coast cities of Palestine large sums for their use, but also undertook to manage the return of this money to the West. The requisite portion of the income of the order was made over to them by its officers, and they directed their correspondents in Acon to deliver the necessary amounts to the chiefs of the order. At the same time those orders that were accustomed to let slip no opportunity for increasing their incomes went into the business of banking on their own account. The Templars, especially, did this, and to the greatest possible extent, not confining their dealings to Palestine and the expeditions undertaken thither. To crowned heads, in particular, the order made loans that

were sometimes very large, and on which, of course, it received a high interest. The Templars became a power capable of regulating the money trade of the entire world, particularly through the fact that the Church constituted them, in a way, the treasurers of all Christendom, inasmuch as she entrusted to the order the management of the money that upon its suggestion, and under its supervision, was brought together for the good of the Holy Land. The collection of the money, of which the Church itself was wont to contribute no small share, was made according to episcopal dioceses. The sums got together were handed over by the bishops to the papal legates commissioned to take them in charge, who in turn gave the bishops receipts. The small coins that were obtained in the course of collection were exchanged for silver, and the whole then sent to Italian bankers by means of merchants that acted as intermediaries. Occasionally the bankers for the sake of safety had the money transported by their own agents. Through them it reached the Pope. He in turn entrusted it to the servants of the various orders, in whose swift sailing vessels, safer than the usual run of ships, it was taken over to Acon. In the same way, other classes made use of the Templars as a means of commercial intercommunication, in so far that by their assistance they not only made payments beyond sea, but also brought in money that lay out at interest, and were able thereby to satisfy their own creditors in the various parts of the West. As this same order of the Temple, aside from its position in the East, was itself compelled, on account of the distribution throughout all the countries of Christendom

of its great and extremely various wealth, everywhere to look after interests that were frequently very considerable, and to send the proceeds of monetary transactions, of whatever character, to the headquarters of its financial government in the chapter-house at Paris, so merchants made use of the order in carrying on commerce within the continent of Europe. By means of the subordinate agents and offices situated throughout the continent, they were able to collect debts, or to make payments that were due, and to settle their accounts at regular times in the Paris branch of the Templars, in order to balance debit and credit. So this central house of the Templars gradually acquired the importance of a European exchange, where the transactions carried on through the order were adjusted and settled, and outstanding debts were balanced against liabilities. France became the rival of Italy in the market of the world.

Of all the results brought about by the crusades, as regards the economic development of the countries of Western Europe, perhaps the most important and the most fruitful in consequences was this evolution of exchange, taking place as it did by what might be called an organic process. For the effect of creating new markets and of making exchange easier and more varied, was to make the previously existing political and national boundaries less important as regarded trade and commerce. While the ultimate result of this evolution was to consolidate interests that had hitherto been foreign or inimical to one another, to unite nation with nation through bonds at once beneficent and lasting, the first

effects of this correlating influence were naturally felt by those smaller communities that stood in comparatively close connection with one another. Thereby the freedom of movement, and consequently the productive power of each community, increased *pari passu* with that of the nation at large. Through this there came about further important changes, not only in the economic, but also in the political life of Europe, which in their turn had a corresponding effect upon the commercial growth of the countries concerned. Up to this time, we have been discussing the immediate influences that the crusades exerted upon the economic life of Western Europe through the introduction of natural products hitherto unknown, through the dissemination of new luxuries, the creation of new wants, and the comparative ease with which the facilitated circulation of large sums of money enabled these wants to be satisfied. When we proceed to treat the secondary results of these wars, we find that our investigation does not yield by any means as certain results. With what evidence we have, we cannot, in considering them, establish the connection between the changes taking place in the West and the Eastern influences that brought them about, whereas, in the former case, we had to do with relations that left traces in language, and with processes that produced visible and tangible results in the shape of the use of foreign materials, the adoption of foreign dress, and the imitation of foreign customs. In the case of these secondary results, moreover, it may occasionally be disputed, of all the lines of connection imaginable or actually possible under the cir-

cumstances, which is the right one, or indeed whether by a *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* process we have not come to postulate courses of development unwarranted by the facts.

Nowadays, no one will in any seriousness combat the statement that the motives that occasioned the first crusade, and so brought about a reflux of the Western races to the Orient that lasted almost two centuries, had only in part to do with religion and particularly with the Church. At the root of these so-called Holy Wars, there lay from the beginning causes of a very worldly character, some of which were social, while others were economic. It is for that reason that the results of these wars, if we look away for a moment from their religious character, appear to have consisted at first in the subversion and total destruction of the hitherto existing social order, and of the forms of economic life that it had called forth. Since, moreover, the evil conditions whereby such large numbers were brought to undertake expeditions against the Mohammedans varied greatly among the nations of Europe, it followed that taking part in the crusades produced different results in different countries. (Only one force acted upon all nations in a similar degree, namely, the movement towards social freedom, towards releasing the lower classes from the bondage that had hitherto weighed so heavily upon them. In France, the rural population groaned under the unendurable burden of the nobility, their landlords. The German people supported painfully and with difficulty the War of the Investitures, which had entirely destroyed the civil order, had set every man's hand against his

neighbor, and had thrown thousands upon thousands into a consuming strife with conscience. Italy was in a state of irredeemable confusion. In England, citizen and peasant alike lay crushed under the inhuman despotism of the Norman Conqueror, who ruled by the right of the strong hand. The whole continent was in a ferment, and the despairing masses were willing to rush into any course of action that promised an instant and complete change in their miserable condition. Moreover, to political unrest, to moral bewilderment, to ecclesiastical oppression, there were added burdensome material cares necessarily consequent upon a period of hard times. For years harvest after harvest had failed. Throughout by far the greater part of Western Europe, there existed, if not exactly a state of starvation, yet a state of want, entailing painful labor for his daily bread upon the common man. If compelled to turn into money what he could in any way spare from his narrow means, he must throw it away at a wretched price,—for there was a stringency in the money market. Many had thus deprived themselves of house and home, and stood absolutely destitute of provision for the future. To them the call to take part in the great enterprises bound for the Holy Land came like a glimpse of salvation. In assuming the Cross, they freed themselves at a stroke from all their cares, and not only obtained the certain prospect of an eternal reward in Heaven, but at once came into the employment here on earth of highly important advantages that, as matters then stood, could hardly have been theirs in any other way.

Even at such a time, when pious zeal was aroused to so high a pitch, the Church did not lose sight of the fact that abstract and lofty motives could not exercise an enduring influence upon the great mass of the people, and hence it very prudently strove to inflame, in a still greater degree, their crusading ardor by holding out the further prospect of earthly rewards. The serf was allured by the hope of freedom; the debtor, by that of release from pressing financial obligations; the outlaw, by a promise of pardon and of a reception into the fold. These inducements, and others of a similar character, she did not hesitate to employ whenever the safety of the possessions held in common beyond the sea by the Western nations came in question, and new armies had to be enlisted for a new crusade. In this way, bond-servants of various sorts actually became free, not only in those cases in which they themselves assumed the Cross, but also whenever their master, anxious for the safety of his own soul, released them from their bondage before he joined the expedition, or when, desirous of providing the means wherewith to purchase arms and equipment for the journey, he sold his right to them and to their services. One of the results of the crusades, then, was to increase considerably the number of free men of the lower classes. And of what significance must this fact have been at a time when the hitherto existing economic conditions, resting at bottom upon the enslavement of the common man, were just beginning to undergo change, and, thanks to their recovered power over their own movements, these freed-

men were afforded a great many opportunities to employ their abilities profitably, and to the advantage of themselves or others. Industries and handicrafts came now to occupy, for the first time, a position on a level with that of agriculture, so long the most important of the occupations. The comparative facility with which commerce could be carried on, the increase in the volume of money and in the ease with which it could be circulated, surrounded them with entirely new industrial conditions, under which the towns became, in the natural course of things, more and more important; even before this, in many districts, had what might be called the centre of gravity of economic development shifted from country to city. Landed property and the degree in which it was productive, though not entirely left out of consideration, yet ceased to be the sole standard by which to measure the prosperity of a nation. The inhabitants of the towns obtained, from the point of view of economics, the upper hand and, from that of politics, were on the way to assume a different position from that which they had up to this time occupied.

In the nature of things, this evolutionary process, though everywhere following the same general course and exhibiting the same general features, took on different aspects in the different countries, according to the conditions prevailing in each of them. Consequently its results were not the same in all cases. As no other European nation had taken so active a part in the crusades as had France, so in that country they produced the most noticeable effects upon social conditions and

upon the economic relations dependent on them. Although, as a matter of fact, during the first crusade, the principal direction of this many-headed movement had fallen upon the Normans, inasmuch as they had had most experience in this particular sort of warfare, yet the brunt of the conflict soon came to be sustained by the French. To be sure, the influx into Palestine of representatives of all the Occidental nations was very great, and the crusades bore a quite international character, as being armed expeditions sent out by Western Christendom. Nevertheless, the government of the conquered land along the coast, and the maintenance of the state there founded, both of which seemed at first quite impracticable, were made possible only by the devotion with which the French nobility, for nigh two hundred years, expended all its energies, moral as well as material, in the strictest sense of the word its very lifeblood, in behalf of this object. There could be pointed out few aristocratic families of France that at that time, through some one of their branches, did not have a share in these great Oriental undertakings. Many houses were most intimately bound up with them for generations, while some were, so to speak, transplanted to the East, and did not return to their homes, to which they had almost become strangers, until the end of the thirteenth century. Others, occupied in establishing feudal states in Cyprus or Greece, remained yet longer away from France. As a result of this great and long-continued emigration of the French nobles, the political and social conditions prevailing in France underwent

profound changes. The throne became free thereby of its most dangerous opponents; it increased its own power and wealth at their cost without effort, and in consequence was enabled to afford greater protection to the citizen class, so rapidly becoming prominent, and to attach to itself the reviving peasantry. Moreover, the country as a whole was disburdened of those turbulent classes whose right to bear arms gave them importance, who depended upon war for their existence, and who decayed rapidly during a long period of internal quiet.

What significance all this had for the social, and consequently for the economic, development of France may be readily seen by a brief comparison with the state of things in Germany. The first crusade, though to be sure great numbers of Germans had taken part in it, was not, on the whole, a matter in which the people at large were interested; for their attention was almost entirely taken up with the politico-religious struggle with the Papacy, in which the right of investiture formed the principal subject of disagreement. The tragic outcome undergone on the desolate plains of Phrygia by the expedition upon which, in the year 1100-1101, Duke Wulf of Bavaria, Margrave John of Austria, Archbishop Thietmar of Salzburg, and other German nobles had set forth in company with French and Italian crusaders, must have acted as a terrible warning. As a class, the German nobility would have nothing whatever to do with the movement for the recovery of Palestine. In consequence, they were neither impoverished nor reduced in numbers, nor was their military and political importance

diminished. On the contrary, they constituted a burden even heavier than before upon the civil and economic evolution of Germany. Not only did the warlike barons, to rid the country of whom, even to lessen whose numbers, there were no outside interests, prevent a complete reconciliation of the opposing parties through the renunciation on the part of the Church of its interest in worldly affairs, and of its pretensions to worldly dominion, but their passionate contentions rendered of no avail the great work of peace undertaken by the German ecclesiastics, which, even after the accession of the excommunicated Emperor, had been accomplishing more and more for the good of the lower classes, of the artisans and laborers. Conditions of political and industrial order, under which bearing arms was no longer regarded as the noblest occupation, were not looked upon with favor by these lords. In order that such a state of affairs should not last, they made common cause with the irreconcilable Pope and with the Emperor's son, whom the former had seduced into treachery and revolt. To this coalition Henry IV. succumbed, and by it the great social and economic question then confronting Germany was answered. She did not enter upon the path of social progress and industrial development that France, relieved through the crusades of her unproductive military classes, had struck out for herself.

A glance at the peculiar character of the economic conditions prevailing in Upper Italy will enable us to see even more clearly how this state of affairs compelled Germany to lag behind other countries in the matter of

commercial progress. There also, to the detriment of trade, had existed up to this time the sharp division between the productive classes, on the one hand, and a military nobility, living by arms alone, on the other. Like the German barons, who were kept at home by disorder in Church and State, the aristocracy of Upper and Middle Italy had taken comparatively little part in the crusades, while the Italian citizens, whose interest in them had from the beginning been rather commercial than religious, took even less. Consequently both classes were able to come without difficulty to an agreement in opposition to the new industrial conditions and the demands that these made upon them. The nobles that had hitherto been dwelling on their estates in the country transferred their residence to the cities, and allied themselves with the old patrician houses, bringing into existence thereby a new city nobility. In return for the honor and social rank accorded them, they assumed the burden of the city's government and of its military affairs, so that the citizens themselves, free from responsibility, were able to devote their undivided energies to trade and commerce, which the crusades, wherewith Italy was so closely bound up, made to thrive in a way most unlooked for.

Finally, in our consideration of the economic and industrial development that came about in Europe under the influence of the crusades, we must take into account the fact that these great folk-movements, whereby in the course of generations unnumbered thousands were drawn to the East, had brought about a great diminution in

population, a diminution that must have been particularly noticeable in the more thickly settled districts, whose inhabitants, in view of the limited productivity of the land devoted to agriculture, had difficulty in obtaining sustenance. The power of attraction that the industrial activity of the cities caused them to exercise upon the country people, begot a great migration townwards, thus affording an instructive parallel to certain well known social phenomena of our own day. At the same time, this diminution of the rural population enabled those remaining behind, who were less thickly crowded together and who gained their livelihood more easily, to devote greater care to tilling the ground, and so to increase the productiveness of the soil. Another factor in this process is to be seen in the changes in the ownership of land occasioned by the crusades. Many noblemen, in order to gain the money wherewith to prosecute expeditions to the Holy Land, sold their estates, in many cases to neighboring churches and cloisters, whose careful husbandry was of benefit to the land, and served usefully as an example to the landowners of the surrounding districts.

When we survey the various stimuli that the crusades supplied to the economic development of Western Europe, and examine them in their totality, we perceive that their immediate results are the most apparent and the most easily established by proof, since they had to do with the introduction into the West of manufactures and natural products from the Orient, and since they left behind indelible traces in the shape of words and phrases

that became a part of the European vocabulary. Nevertheless, these immediate results were on the whole superficial, and contributed comparatively little to the great revolution that transformed, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the economic conditions of Europe. This revolution is far more to be considered as the outcome of processes that cannot be referred definitely to any source, and, even while they were going on, were either quite misunderstood by the men of the time, or were not noticed at all. For we have here to do with processes insignificant in themselves and, at the same time, independent of one another, so that they produced their important results only through being constantly repeated. Yet they were brought about under similar conditions, and affected whole countries in the same way, and thus, for one who regards them from a distance as a whole, they compose the complete picture of a radical social change, and, by consequence, of a change in industrial conditions. \The old foundations upon which, up to this time, the industrial relations of the Middle Ages had rested, were in this transition period for the first time shaken, overthrown, or destroyed, in so far that there now existed large classes no longer depending for subsistence upon the soil. Changes had been introduced thereby into the mode of life, and the great new principle of freedom of person and property had been set forth and established, in finance and commerce alike, with the result of calling into being a new social and commercial organization.) This industrial emancipation, moreover, was accompanied by an intellectual one.

Though the crusades appear, at first sight, as the greatest triumph of the Church, they are ever more clearly seen, when considered from the point of view of their larger relations and of their ultimate outcome, to have been the cause of its fall. Then dropped the veil where-with the Church had blinded the eyes of Occidental Christendom, and particularly of Western Europe. For the Europeans learned in a measure, through what they now knew of the East, to see and appreciate how little the world corresponded to the picture the Church had drawn of it, how, on the other hand, it supplied a multitude of things that were new, beautiful, and good, and the enjoyment of which they refused longer to forego. And, while enjoying these new pleasures, they overcame the prejudices sedulously fostered by the Church, and arrived at a state of intellectual and moral independence comparable to that industrial liberty that came to them as the outcome of the crusades.

THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE AND THE
CRUSADES



CHARLES DIEHL



THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE AND THE CRUSADES¹



WHEN Pope Urban II., in the month of November, 1095, began to preach the crusade at Clermont, Alexius I., Comnenus, was reigning over the Greek Empire of the East. Borne to the throne in 1081 by a feudal and military revolution,

this great lord had revealed himself to the world as a remarkable leader of the state. An excellent general, a good administrator, a clever and adroit diplomatist, he had by dint of energy and skill dispelled the perils which threatened the Empire; he had turned back the invasion of the Petchenegs and the Poloutzes, and the still more dangerous invasion of the Normans of Italy; he had reorganized the army and the fleet; he had triumphed over the discontent and conspiracies which threatened his growing power; and he had done much to make the imperial authority more absolute and to reestablish in the monarchy the unity so essential to its existence. After fourteen years of efforts,

(1) Translated by Mr. C. H. C. Wright of Harvard University.

in which time he had pacified his European possessions and extended the Byzantine frontiers to the Balkans, Alexius began to think of taking up in Asia the struggle against the Turks; and although of late years the unbelievers had made great progress, the death of the Sultan Malek-Shah (1092), and the anarchy which followed, seemed likely to favor the success of the Byzantine arms. It was at this moment that the crusade, in that it caused the Greek Emperor new and anxious cares and obliged him to devote to other purposes the time, money, and men which he would have used in combating the Turks, seriously disturbed the situation of the Byzantine monarchy and perhaps hastened its decline and ruin.

It was said afterwards, and for a long time believed, that Alexius himself called the West to his aid, and there was current in Europe a pretended imperial letter addressed to the Count of Flanders, in which the Basileus, in order to persuade the Franks to give him assistance, boasted of the wealth of Constantinople, the relics preserved there, and especially of the beauty of Greek women. No one today doubts the spuriousness of this document.¹ To be sure, for several years Alexius had preserved fairly cordial relations with the papacy; he displayed before the eyes of Urban II. vague prospects for the union of the two Churches; he endeavored to take advantage of the papal good will in order to recruit in Italy the mercenaries needed by him. Like his predecessors, indeed, he was ready to seek among the adven-

(1) See, however, Hagenmeyer, *Der Brief des Kaisers Alexios I. an den Grafen Robert I. von Flandern*, Byz. Zeitschr, 1897.

turers of the West a vigorous support and reinforcement for the Byzantine arms; and in 1087 he had even requested Count Robert of Flanders, then staying in Constantinople, to send him a reinforcement of five hundred horsemen against the Petchenegs. But he was too wise to turn loose of his own accord on the Empire those numberless hosts of crusaders who reminded the Byzantines of the ancient migrations of the peoples; and his first care, when he learned of their approach, was to collect troops, in order, if necessary, to give them battle.

At the time when the disorderly mobs of the popular crusade, soon followed by the scarcely more disciplined army of knights, poured into the Greek Empire their invading tide, Constantinople was still one of the most admirable cities of the world. In its markets were collected or exchanged merchandise from all parts of the earth. From the homes of its artisans issued everything that was known to the Middle Ages in the way of refined and elaborate luxury,—silks and purples, brocades, gold and silver wares, jewels, wrought ivory caskets, bronzes inlaid with silver, manuscripts with splendid miniatures, and reliquaries with enamel set in gold. Through the streets passed a multicolored and noisy crowd, in gay array, so richly dressed that according to a contemporary writer they all “seemed like the offspring of kings.” In the public squares surrounded by palaces and porticos were displayed the masterpieces of ancient art.

In the churches, with their giant cupolas, the mosaics emitted flashes of gold through the profusion of porphyry

and of marble. In the imperial palaces, Blachern or Boucoleon, so vast that they seemed like cities within the city, the long, vaulted rooms displayed an unexampled luxury. The travelers who visited Constantinople in the course of this twelfth century, the pilgrims of the crusade who took the trouble to record in their naïve language the feelings they experienced,—Benjamin of Tudela, or Edrisi, or Villehardouin, or Robert of Clari,—cannot refrain from exclamations of admiration, and from wondering descriptions. The Western troubadours who heard the echoes of these splendors, spoke of Constantinople as of a fairyland, and were never weary of celebrating the enchantments of the imperial palace,—the children in bronze winding their horns, the revolving room, turned by the breezes of the sea, the resplendent carbuncle which lighted up the apartments during the night. Other writers enumerate the precious relics which filled the churches. But one expression is constantly repeated by every one,—the marvelous and wonderful wealth of the city, which, says Villehardouin, “was supreme over all others.” Nor is this all. When the great cities of modern Europe were, for the most part, but sorry and insignificant villages, Constantinople was the sovereign of good taste, the true centre of the civilized world. While the coarse knights of the West cared only for hunting or fighting, Byzantine life was infinitely luxurious and refined, manners were curiously elaborate, the love of exquisite pleasures and a taste for art and letters universally predominant. And even more than by material prosperity, the rude Latin barons were

dazzled by the wonders of the pompous ceremonial that surrounded the person of the Basileus, by the complicated etiquette which placed an abyss between the proud ruler of Byzantium and the remainder of the human race, by the theatrical apotheosis in which the Emperor appeared to them as the representative of God,—indeed as an emanation from him. And if one reflects that to this piling up of wealth, so likely to arouse envy, to this display of insolent arrogance, so well-calculated to ruffle sensitive self-esteem, was to be added the old misunderstanding increased by the recent memories of the schism still existing between the West and the East; if we consider, on the other hand, that in this elaborate society, in this court with its minutely determined hierarchies, the Franks appeared like ill-bred boors, like inconvenient and annoying elements of disturbance, it may be readily understood that from the first day of the meeting between Greek and Latin, the fundamental antagonism of the two civilizations immediately appeared in mutual suspicion, continual difficulties, incessant conflicts, reciprocal charges of brutality and treachery. The echoes of this conflict have reached through the ages, from the times of the crusades to our own day, and have contributed in no small degree to perpetuating in the West so many deeply-rooted and unjust prejudices against the Byzantine Empire.

I.

Alexius was, with good reason, troubled by the approach of the crusaders. He could not fully understand the great outburst of religious enthusiasm which

carried Europe across the Greek Empire to the conquest of the Holy Sepulchre; he was suspicious of the violent ways of the Westerners, their inconstancy, their readiness to break compacts. He had hitherto known the Latins especially by the ambitious schemes of Robert Guiscard, and he was rightly annoyed at finding among the leaders of the crusade Robert's own son,—Bohemond. He incessantly feared some sudden onslaught upon Constantinople. And thus, while, as befitted a Christian prince, he gave a welcome to the Franks and furnished them freely with the necessary supplies, the Emperor took care to watch and regulate their advance, to let these armies, in their interminable passage, halt only one by one under the walls of his capital. The crusaders, on their part, did nothing to diminish the anxieties of the Byzantine ruler. Dazzled by the wealth of the Empire, full of contempt for the schismatic Greeks, they went through the Byzantine land like professional bandits, burning, pillaging, ravaging everything on their way. The companions of Peter the Hermit, according to their own leader, behaved like "robbers and brigands." When the army of the princes appeared in turn before Constantinople, its behavior was scarcely more reassuring. Many great barons, oblivious of the religious object of their undertaking, were tempted to neglect Jerusalem in order to throw themselves upon their prey, and thought chiefly of their own private interests. It is easy to appreciate why, in the presence of these multitudes "more numerous than the stars of Heaven or the sands of the sea," in the presence of the ambitious lords

"who dreamed of the Empire of Byzantium," Alexius Comnenus was, as his daughter wrote in the *Alexiad*, "immersed in a sea of troubles."

With undeniable skill he tried to make the best of the situation. The Empire had never renounced its claims to the lost provinces of Syria and of Asia; Alexius planned to make use of the crusaders in regaining these territories. Persuaded that by the use of money he would obtain from the Latins whatever he desired, he lavished bounties upon the soldiers and magnificent gifts upon the leaders, expecting, in return for these great expenditures, to induce them to acknowledge him as their lord. Very proud, moreover, of his imperial dignity, he had no intention of treating them as equals. They appeared to him mercenaries whom he was taking into his pay, and the better to bind them to him he tried to enter into their feudal ways, and to obtain from them an oath of fidelity and of homage, by which they should pledge themselves to hand over their conquests to him or to hold them as his vassals. The leaders of the crusade understood very well that without the help of the Greeks they would not be able to carry out their undertaking. Accordingly, after more or less resistance, they ended by yielding to the wishes of the Basileus. Alexius, on the other hand, tried by an adroit admixture of generosity and of severity to prove to them that without him they would not be able to do anything, and with unparalleled skill, he took advantage, to reach his end, of all the weaknesses and all the defects of the Latins. After

G

lengthy negotiations they reached a semblance of agreement.

It was not easy. Godfrey of Bouillon, one of the first among the chiefs of the crusaders who arrived at Constantinople (December, 1096), began by a peremptory refusal to take the oath as exacted. He had to be constrained by hunger and even by an appeal to force. The proud Raymond of Toulouse displayed quite as much ill-will, and by his arrogant bearing towards the Emperor came near causing a war among the Christians. Others, Robert of Flanders, Stephen of Blois, and Bohemond himself were more diplomatic. But significant anecdotes betray the distrust and antipathy felt by both sides. Anna Comnena, for instance, relates that when on one occasion Alexius sent to Bohemond a large quantity of meat, the crafty Norman took care not to touch it himself, but gave it to his companions to eat, asking them the next day, with great interest, particulars as to their health. Another day, at a formal reception, one of the Frankish barons insolently sat down on the Emperor's own throne, and when Count Baldwin made him get up and called his attention to the necessity of conforming with the customs of the country, the other discontentedly muttered, as he gazed at the Basileus, "Well, look at that boor, who remains seated when so many great captains are standing." Alexius, "who had long been familiar with the overweening ways of the Latins," said nothing. To endure such insolence, Comnenus needed remarkable patience, a ready supply of good temper and kindness, and a real desire to humor

dangerous allies. The Byzantines relate, in a horrified way, how all day long the barons used to come and annoy the prince by their familiarities, their gossip, their demands for money, without even allowing him time to take his meals. At any rate, by well-timed concessions he achieved his ends, and he made a good impression, on the whole, upon the majority of the crusaders. Stephen of Blois, one of the most learned of the Latin barons writes to his wife that "there is not in Heaven a man to be compared with the Emperor" for generosity and graciousness. By this means, as much as by his skill as a diplomat, Alexius succeeded in May, 1097, in concluding a definite treaty. The Basileus pledged himself to take the cross, to follow up the Latin army, and he at once furnished it, under the orders of Tatikios, with a corps of auxiliaries. In return, the Christian princes took an oath of homage to the Emperor, and pledged themselves to return to him the cities of Asia and of Syria that they might chance to conquer. Immediately afterwards the Latin army collected at Nicæa; Alexius could flatter himself that he had, by his skill, warded off the danger with which the crusade threatened him.

Indeed, this first contact had sufficed to show the absolute lack of harmony that existed between the crusaders and the Byzantines; good feeling could never be very sincere between them. The Emperor wished to make use of the barons as mercenaries, to recover for the Greek monarchy lost Asia; the Frankish princes wanted to conquer lands for themselves. A rupture, therefore,

must perforce soon take place between them. But is that any reason why the Greek Emperor should have been made alone responsible, and why his ingratitude, his perfidy, and treachery should be criticised as was done in the West? When the difficulties and hardships of the crusades were known in the West, it seemed convenient to lay all the blame on Alexius without considering whether incapacity, rivalry of the Latin chiefs, lack of foresight, and want of discretion, were not the main reasons. When, a little later, Bohemond was in open conflict with Alexius, he found it to his interest to spread the legend unfavorable to Comnenus and to represent him in the West as the persistent enemy of all the crusaders. In fact, though misunderstanding arose early between the Latins and the Basileus, it was not from him that the first difficulties came. "Once he had contracted a treaty with them," says the most recent historian of Alexius Comnenus, "the Basileus proved faithful to his word, and the rupture between him and the Latin princes is largely to be attributed to the bad faith of the latter."¹

It can, in fact, hardly be truthfully alleged against the Emperor, inasmuch as Nicæa after its conquest was to be handed over to him, that he had wished to save the city from the horrors of an assault and capture, and that he had secretly negotiated with the inhabitants for its direct surrender to his troops. And, indeed, the crusaders with

(1) Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Comnène*, Paris, 1900, p. 166. Cf. the recent work by R. Röhrich, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*, Innsbrück, 1901.

whom Alexius shared a large part of the booty did not, in general, seem to have considered his act treacherous; at the time of parting from the Basileus, who had come to Asia to give them advice, they received from him, writes one of them, gifts of priceless value, and most of the barons left him with kindly feelings. Alexius, on his part, prided himself on having behaved towards them "not as a kinsman or a friend, but as a father." It was only before Antioch that things began to go wrong, when the council of the crusade, yielding to the demands of Bohemond, promised him, notwithstanding the treaty concluded with the Basileus, the lordship of the city (January, 1098). It may be understood why, at this news, Tatikios withdrew with his contingent from the Latin army and that the Emperor, who had employed the spring of 1098 in reconquering this part of Asia Minor, was rightly displeased at losing, in violation of promises, the strongest citadel of Northern Syria. The handing over of Antioch to Bohemond justified all the fears that he had first felt at the arrival of the crusaders. He considered himself deceived, and, altering his demeanor, he not only made this incident a pretext for interrupting his advance towards Constantinople, and for leaving the Latins to get out of the clutches of Kerboga as well as they could, but he took every step thereafter to thwart the growing ambitions of Bohemond. He first used diplomacy; he skilfully spread dissension in the Frankish army; he fostered, to oppose the Normans, the dissatisfaction of Raymond of Saint-Gilles, and promised particularly, in case Antioch were restored to him, to join

once more, in accordance with his agreement, the crusading army (April, 1099). When he saw his proposals neglected; when he saw in reconquered Syria independent states arise at Edessa, Antioch, and Jerusalem; when, especially, he saw Bohemond, whom he rightly judged the one most to be feared among the Latins, increase his principality at the expense of the Greeks as well as of the Turks, the dissatisfied mutterings soon broke into open war. By 1100 the Byzantine fleet was cruising in the waters of Cyprus and Syria, and although Alexius was hostile to Bohemond alone, although he treated very well, in spite of the disorders which they committed, the crusaders in the great expedition of 1101, public opinion of the West, incapable of understanding the lamentable disaster which overcame this last expedition, believed more and more in treachery on the part of the Byzantine Emperor. Indeed the alliance was broken. Instead of endeavoring to maintain against the common foe, the Turk, that close union which was equally advantageous to the Franks and to Byzantium, of which Godfrey of Bouillon dreamed, Alexius, in his wounded pride, thought only of taking back Antioch; the imperial troops entered Cilicia and attacked Laodicea by land and sea; there were mutual reproaches of violated oaths, of failure to keep pledges, and things went so far that at the end of 1104 Bohemond sailed for the West to stir up a new crusade,—this time against Constantinople. In 1107, with thirty-four thousand men, the Norman~~y~~ landed at Avlona, and planned to repeat the triumphal campaign of his father in 1081. Again

the skill and composure of Comnenus prevailed over the invaders; a treaty signed at Deabolis (September, 1108) made Bohemond the Emperor's liege-man, and Antioch a vassal state, much reduced in size and no longer dangerous to the Empire, inasmuch as the passes of the Amanus and of Cilicia were handed over to the Byzantines. And though it be true that the death of Bohemond (1111) by enabling Tancred, his successor, to refuse to carry out the convention, deprived Alexius of the real benefit of this great success, the pact of Deabolis nevertheless gave imperial ambitions a claim which they could continue to maintain.

Alexius Comnenus has often been reproached for his conduct towards the crusaders. But we have seen that he was not the crafty and cowardly deceiver that tradition has made him, and that his bad faith seems less evident than that of the Latins. Undoubtedly he was wrong in not understanding the advantage to himself of a united action with the men of the West. But Comnenus, it has been said, was before all a Byzantine Basilus, interested above everything in the welfare of the Byzantine state. He had not summoned the crusaders; he tried to use them for the best advantage of the Empire, and he achieved the difficult but meritorious result of both avoiding a conflict with the Latins and of leading them, by his skill, to the point he desired. Later, when he found out that he could not obtain from them what he had at first hoped, he continued without them, and against them, the task of reconquering Asia, which he had undertaken. Moreover, it must be remembered

that he broke off openly only from Bohemond, and that he remained to the end on good terms with the other crusaders.

II.

The policy of Manuel, at the time of the second crusade,—that of Isaac Angelus during the third,—was not very different from that of Alexius.

Manuel Comnenus had no hostility against the Latins; he had married a German princess, Bertha of Salzbach, sister-in-law of the king of Germany, Conrad III. After her death, he sought a second wife among the nobility of French Syria. He gladly surrounded himself with Latins; he found among them the best soldiers of his army and some of the high dignitaries of the court. He himself was, in many respects, like a Western knight. Tall, of commanding appearance and remarkable strength, he admired feats of swordsmanship and dangerous adventures, and his bravery more than once verged on foolhardiness. He delighted in the violent physical exercises of the West,—hunts and tourneys,—in which he held his own against the best Latin combatants. Like a paladin, he wished by great exploits to deserve the love of his lady, and she readily acknowledged that, though born in a land where people were familiar with feats of prowess, she had never heard of a man capable of such brave deeds. And so, Manuel made a deep impression on the Latins, and the Frankish chroniclers of Syria never cease sounding his praises. But the doughty knight was also a Byzantine Emperor,

very conscious of the grandeur and majesty of the Empire, and very anxious to restore its former prestige; he was full of ambition and pride. In the Norman rulers of the Two Sicilies he saw the hated obstacles on which all of his plans for the conquest of Italy had been dashed to pieces; in the emperors of Germany he was inclined to see mere usurpers; though in the very middle of the twelfth century, he was dreaming of Justinian, and during his whole life he had one aim,—the reconstitution of the old Roman Empire. With such convictions it is easy to understand how the crusade of 1147 seemed to Manuel a peculiar annoyance. By energetic means he had just imposed his suzerainty upon the prince of Antioch; he was at open war with the Normans of Sicily. This was the time chosen by the West to solicit his interest in the cause of the Holy Sepulchre, to the end that he might allow the two great armies of Conrad III. and of Louis VI. to march unmolested across the Greek Empire. Manuel was all the more disturbed because, though he deemed himself fairly sure of the Germans, his allies, he knew that the French were rather unfavorably disposed toward the foe of the Normans of Antioch and Sicily, and he was even more disturbed than Alexius had previously been at the prospect of their appearing before Constantinople. Finally, the Emperor and his subjects, too, began to grow weary of these perpetual passings of crusaders, who exhausted the land and emptied the treasury. The West continued to insist that the Basileus should take an interest in the crusade; but the crusade was in his opinion only a hindrance to

his policy, and he hoped to find in it only a means of furthering his private plans.

From the beginning, a misunderstanding was certain and a conflict unavoidable. Manuel, like Alexius, had given a cordial reception to the Germans who went by first, and though he took military measures to watch their progress he had them supplied with provisions. But soon the ill-disciplined troops of Conrad began to pillage, and quarrels broke out to which the greed of the Greeks contributed, by the way, quite as much as the brutality of the Latins. Like Alexius, Manuel had tried to keep the Frankish army away from Constantinople. He was unable to succeed, and the Germans even plundered the suburbs of the capital. It was only with difficulty and by a combination of diplomacy and force that he succeeded in making them pass on to Asia. With the French, things went scarcely better; the inhabitants, already exasperated by the passage of the Germans, treated them with great distrust; the Emperor could be reconciled to according them a favorable reception only in the hope of profiting by their conquests. What Manuel asked of the crusaders was, like the demands of his grandfather, a pledge of fidelity and homage, and, moreover, a treaty of alliance against the Normans. Nor did he expect, any more than Alexius did, to treat them as equals; he had already had certain disputes about etiquette with Conrad III., and, though Louis VII., more devoted to the interests of the crusade, showed less haughtiness, yet some of his barons were shocked at the Byzantine demands. The victories,

moreover, that the Normans were winning at that very time in Greece added to their fury at the truce concluded by the Emperor with the Sultan of Iconium, and they openly proposed to take possession of Constantinople. It may be understood why the Emperor, to rid himself of such dangerous neighbors, should not have refrained from deceit, especially when he had obtained from Louis VII. the pledge which he desired. Does this imply that he is to be held responsible for the failure of the crusade? Nothing goes to show that the guides he gave to the Germans intentionally misled and betrayed them, and the allegation that Manuel notified the Turks is more uncertain still. He received, on the contrary, the remnants of the German army, offered a kind welcome to Conrad, who was beaten and ill, gave the French the best advice for their progress, and, though he refused to assist them by the force of arms, his attitude personally towards them was irreproachable. It must be acknowledged, however, that the Greek inhabitants fleeced or starved the Latins. But we must remember, also, the crusaders' lack of discipline, their plundering, and the well-grounded fears that their presence inspired! Add to this that at the same time the Normans were plundering the Empire, the Venetians, by their cupidity, their arrogance, and the increasing influence which they were acquiring in the East, exasperated the Greeks against all Westerners. However this may be, the second crusade served but to increase the misunderstandings which dated from the first. Once more, in the West, and especially in France, the Greeks were made responsible for the

failure of the undertaking, and the expedition of 1147 narrowly escaped being followed by a European war. In 1150 Suger himself thought of uniting in a crusade against the Greek Empire Louis VII., Conrad III., the Pope, and Roger of Sicily; and if the plan failed, it was only because the king of Germany refused to violate the compact of friendship and alliance which, in 1148, he had made with Manuel at Constantinople.

Between the second and the third crusade hostility constantly increased between the West and Byzantium. The ambitious policy of Manuel, by entangling the Empire in important European questions, had, by multiplying points of contact, sharpened the antagonism between Greek and Latin. The ten years of the Norman War left behind long-enduring hatreds; the vast schemes of the Basileus soon brought him into latent hostility, and then open conflict, with the powerful Emperor of Germany,—Frederick Barbarossa. Venice was disturbed by the sight of the Byzantine fleets cruising through the Adriatic, and the knowledge of the growing Byzantine influence in Hungary, Dalmatia, and Italy. On their part, the Greeks were indignant at the encroachments of the Venetians in the Empire, at their wealth, and at their plans to monopolize the commerce of the Orient. And so the breach grew wider every day. Violent incidents attest the bitterness of accumulated hatred. In 1171, on one day, Manuel had arrested all the Venetians established in the Empire and war broke out for a period of four years. In 1182 Andronicus set the mob of the capital upon the Venetians, who were

massacred with all the refinements of cruelty. The West took vengeance by the capture of Thessalonica, where the Normans pillaged and massacred (1185). Under such circumstances it is easy to imagine the terror caused by the news of the third crusade (1188). Isaac Angelus hastened to send a formal embassy to Nuremberg to obtain assurances that the proposed expedition concealed no hostile purpose against the Greek Empire, and in spite of the promises made, his anxiety increased when he saw Frederick Barbarossa enter into friendly relations with the rebellious subjects of Byzantium,—the zupan of Serbia, Stephan Nemanya and the Asans, who had just reëstablished the independence of Bulgaria. As usual the imperial government had promised supplies to the crusaders; as usual, also, the Basileus had collected troops to watch their progress; naturally, too, hostilities took place between the populations and the Latins. Isaac, in his agitation, spoiled everything by his mistaken policy; he asked for hostages, demanded a pledge that one half of the conquests won by the Latins should be turned over to the Byzantines, quibbled over points of etiquette, and finally thought it proper to hold as prisoners the hostages sent him by Barbarossa and to attack the Germans with his troops. Frederick, wounded in his pride, and outraged in his sense of loyalty, had no further scruples. They fought at Philippopolis; Adrianople was pillaged, together with the country round about, and a halt for the winter was made in the Empire as in a conquered land. The most disturbing rumors traveled through the army as to the bad faith and treachery of the Greeks; more-

over, Isaac was blamed for the treaty he had just concluded with the foe of Christianity,—Saladin. And already Barbarossa was planning to march on Constantinople; he requested the assistance for the spring of 1190 of the fleets of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa; he entered into negotiations with the Servians and the Bulgarians; he invited the Pope to preach a crusade against the disloyal Greeks,—when fortunately for Byzantium, on February 14, 1190, Isaac signed the agreement which assured to the crusaders their passage to Asia. More fortunate than his predecessors, the Basileus this time succeeded in keeping the Latins away from his capital; Frederick consented to embark at Gallipoli. But all these disagreements had merely accentuated the hatred, and to save the Empire in its straits another ruler was needed than the incompetent Isaac. And so, when, on January 1, 1203, the barons of the fourth crusade saw arrive at Zara the young prince, Alexius, who asked for their protection and urged them to conquer Constantinople, they yielded without much resistance to the temptation offered by the opportunity of satisfying at one and the same time both their greed and their grudges, and they easily succumbed to the suggestions of the Venetians, who had long been eager to destroy the Greek Empire and to obtain possession of the best part of it. From the beginning of the crusades, force had seemed the best way to solve a hard problem, and since then people had more than once thought of resorting to it. When the repeated disasters of the crusades had spread through the West legends hostile to Byzantium, when the inci-

dents of the twelfth century had embittered old grudges, when especially to the accumulated hatred and the awakening of greed was added a consciousness of the weakness and exhaustion of the Empire, the Latins could no longer resist. The fourth crusade, preached for the freedom of the Holy Land, changed its purpose before completion and ended in the capture of Constantinople and the ruin of the Greek Empire, through the desires of the Venetians, with the tacit complicity of the Pope, and amid the unanimous applause of the West.

III.

While the imperial course of action was involved in the entanglements caused by the crusades, the Basileus did not lose sight of the states that the crusaders had established in Syria. Godfrey of Bouillon, it would seem, had understood the necessity of combining against Islam all the Christian forces of the East, and he had endeavored to group the Latin principalities into a confederation of states with its centre in Byzantium. His plan ran counter to the prejudices of his companions against the Greeks as well as to the ambitions of the emperors. But the latter, by other means certainly, pursued in general the same aim; during the whole of the twelfth century they persistently endeavored to turn the oath of allegiance taken in 1097 by the crusading princes into the foundation of a real sovereignty of the Greeks over the states of Latin Syria; and by no means one of the lightest proofs of the power of the Byzantine civilization is the

influence which it exerted over the Frankish principalities of the East.

Against Bohemond and Tancred, Alexius, as we have seen, had not ceased to lay claim to imperial rights upon Antioch, and the treaty of 1108 had at least theoretically acknowledged his claims. His son John and his grandson Manuel tried to make them a reality, and to turn the material results of the crusade to the advantage of the Empire. Towards the middle of the twelfth century circumstances were particularly favorable to these ambitions. In 1137, the Emperor, John Comnenus, had just imposed his authority by force of arms on the Armenian princes of Cilicia. At Antioch, divided by internal contentions, one party requested his intervention. At this very moment King Fulk of Jerusalem, beaten by the Emir of Mossoul, was reduced to impotence, and unable to assist against the Basileus, Prince Raymond, his vassal. Confronted with a threatened attack by the Greeks, Antioch, left to itself, was obliged to capitulate; Raymond was forced to take an oath as vassal to the autocrat. Moreover, he must even promise to give up his principality to the Byzantines as soon as they should have conquered a sufficient compensation for it in Saracen territory. After his example, Raymond of Tripoli and Josselin of Edessa acknowledged themselves vassals of the Emperor, and during the whole of 1138 John Comnenus, at the head of the Latin princes, waged war against the Mussulmans, and appeared as the undisputed master of Northern Syria. Soon, carried away by his first success, he dreamed of still more ambitious feats with

Cilicia, the principality of Antioch, and the island of Cyprus; he hoped to form a considerable endowment for his favorite son, Manuel, and, with this purpose, in 1142 he reappeared in Syria. He obliged the count of Edessa to give him his daughter as a token of fidelity; he ordered Raymond of Antioch to hand over his capital; finally, he extended his ambitions to Jerusalem and announced to King Fulk his plan of visiting the Holy Sepulchre, at an early date, and at the head of a large army. For a moment, the unexpected death of the Emperor (April, 1143), gave confidence again to the Latins; and the impetuous Raymond of Antioch thought the moment a fitting one for reconquering the citadels that the Byzantines had deprived him of in Cilicia. But Manuel Comnenus was not less energetic than his father or less punctilious about his rights of sovereignty. Briskly attacked by land and sea, Raymond had to come and humbly sue for pardon at Constantinople before the tomb of the dead Basileus; he was obliged, at the sacred palace, to do homage to Manuel; on these conditions his capital was restored to him, but a Byzantine duke was set up by his side (1144). Thenceforth, and particularly after the failure of the second crusade, the Emperor embraced every opportunity to assert his suzerainty. When, in 1149, the prince of Antioch was killed in battle, Manuel offered his protection to the widow, and tried to induce her to accept as her husband a prince of the imperial house. When, in 1150, Count Josselin of Edessa fell into the hands of the Saracens, the Basileus gave protection and support to the wife.

He was soon to manifest inclinations toward a still more ambitious activity.

In 1155 Renaud of Châtillon was reigning at Antioch.¹ The type of an adventurous knight, recklessly brave but utterly unscrupulous, greedy, plundering, oblivious to pledges, and at times a mere highway robber, he had first very humbly sued for the good will of Manuel, and had readily become his ally against the Armenian princes of Cilicia, who were in rebellion against Byzantium. Then, not judging his services sufficiently rewarded, he had thrown himself upon Cyprus, which belonged to the Emperor, and had ferociously plundered it. This was to invite the thunderbolt upon his own head, as was soon evident,—in 1158. Manuel, exasperated, invaded Syria with a large army; his sudden arrival and the rapid conquest of Cilicia caused an extraordinary panic at Antioch. Resistance was impossible. Renaud had to submit to humiliation. Barefooted, with a rope around his neck, the sleeves of his jacket rolled up to the elbows, holding his sword by the tip, so that the Basileus might grasp the hilt, the prince of Antioch came to the imperial camp, “crying for mercy,” says a contemporary writer, “so long that it made everybody sick.” After a long delay, in which the proud baron was obliged to remain prostrate at the Emperor’s feet, in the presence of the envoys of Christian and Mussulman Syria, Manuel finally consented to restore him to favor, “and admitted him among the vassals of the Empire.” A little later, the king of Jerusalem appeared in turn, and,

(1) Cf. G. Schlumberger, *Renaud de Châtillon*, Paris, 1898.

like Châtillon, promised the Emperor to supply him, on demand, with a certain number of men at arms and knights. The state entrance of the Basileus into Antioch was a still stronger proof of his victory (May, 1159). He rode in on horseback, wearing a crown and magnificently robed, while Prince Renaud, Count Amaury,—brother of the King,—and the other great lords went on foot holding his stirrups; and King Baldwin came a long distance behind, on horseback but without arms, and without the royal insignia. Pompous celebrations, tournaments, and the chase commemorated the triumph of the Basileus. Undisputed master of Syria, Manuel really appeared as the protector of the Latins. At his demand Nouredin gave liberty to six thousand Christian prisoners; through his instrumentality measures were taken to ensure the safety of pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem. When Manuel left for Constantinople, whither important business called him, he could flatter himself on having fulfilled the great ambitions of his predecessors.

To the end of the twelfth century these close relations lasted. Family unions strengthened and cemented the ties. As early as 1157, the king of Jerusalem, Baldwin, had married Theodora, the Emperor's niece; his brother Amaury had married a princess of the race of the Comneni. On his side Manuel, after the death of the first queen, sought the hand of the princess of Tripoli, Melisenda, and finally, in 1161, married the beautiful Maria of Antioch. The sovereigns of Frankish Syria came constantly at this period to Constantinople, either

to renew the homage which they owed to the Emperor, or to ask for his support; and the Greek influence spread more and more in Syria. In 1164, Prince Bohemond III., brother-in-law of the Emperor, freed from imprisonment at Aleppo, thanks to the energetic intervention of Manuel, accepted the establishment of a Greek patriarch at Antioch; in 1169 the king of Jerusalem, Amaury, obtained for his crusade against Egypt the help of the Byzantine forces; in 1177, again, the Greeks and the Latins fought side by side. Syria of the second half of the twelfth century seemed completely subservient to the imperial policy, and the Greek traveler, John Phocas, who visited it in 1177, notices with satisfaction at each stage of his travels the works due to the liberality of "our Emperor and master Manuel Porphyrogenitus Comnenus, the Saviour of the world."

Undoubtedly the death of Amaury (1173), which left the throne of Jerusalem to children, the conquest of Syria by Saladin (1174), and the death finally of Manuel (1180) soon brought to naught these apparent successes of Byzantine policy. The Latin principalities of Syria were daily growing weaker; the Emperor, their lord, was unable seriously to protect them against the Mussulmans. The disaster of Hittin and the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin (1187) were mortal wounds to the Latin ports of Syria, though they succeeded in dragging through some kind of an existence for another century. But, though from a political point of view, the work of the Byzantine emperors was only temporary, still Byzantine civilization at any rate made a deep impression on the Frankish

principalities of the East. It was from the traditions of Byzantine military architecture that the Latin builders borrowed the main arrangements of their castles, the proud citadels of Marga or Karak of the knights,—the ruins of which are still an object of admiration; it was from Byzantine art that the Frankish barons took a part of the luxury with which they adorned their palaces or their churches. For them, as well as for the emperors, the artists of Byzantium were accustomed to make precious specimens of the goldsmith's art and of carved ivory, like those of the Princess Melisenda preserved in the British Museum; for them, as for the emperors, the mosaic makers of Byzantium displayed all their elaborate artistic skill. In the Basilica of the Nativity at Bethlehem may still be seen the remains of the mosaics which, under the reign of King Amaury, by the orders of the Emperor Manuel Comnenus, Ephreas wrought for the decoration of the church. By their general arrangement as by the subjects represented, by their style as by the accompanying inscriptions, these works are purely Byzantine. And, indeed, they date from the time when between the Latins of the East and Byzantium the political and religious intimacy had become close enough to permit a Frankish bishop to place in this Latin church a portrait of the Basileus, Manuel, as one of a benefactor, and for a Latin chronicler to speak of the Greek Emperor in these terms, "He was an eminent man, the most kindly of all princes upon earth; his memory will be blessed forevermore." Such a perfect understanding is of itself sufficient to show the injustice of all the disastrous prejudices

which were nourished against Byzantium by the crusaders of the West; and it is no slight token of the power of assimilation which belonged to the Greek Empire in the twelfth century to find in these states of the Latin East, where one would least expect them, such profound traces of the political activity of the Basileus and of Byzantine civilization.

220-0
20

c

bes
49
50
75



3 2044 023 787 021

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

Harvard College Widener Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 (617) 495-2413

